2008

Rebuilding rural Newfoundland

Jennifer L. Butler
University of Windsor

REBUILDING RURAL NEWFOUNDLAND: NEOLIBERAL DISCOURSE AND NARRATIVES OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

By

Jennifer L. Butler

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through Sociology and Anthropology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2007

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-42255-7
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-42255-7

ABSTRACT

This thesis draws on a governmentality approach to explore how rural development has been informed by the emergence of neoliberal governing in Newfoundland and Labrador. I explore how neoliberal techniques, specifically partnership and responsibilization, create an approach to 'community' and set the terms for local engagement in community initiatives. Using critical discourse analysis, I explore how government documents draw on neoliberal discourse to govern rural development initiatives and sketch the effects of this governing on the initiatives of a particular community, Goose Brook. I argue the monolithic approach to neoliberalism, which has been characteristic of governmentality studies, is limited. The neoliberal policy which is embedded in federal and provincial government documents is contested and reproduced by local actors' own interpretations. I conclude that further ethnographic research can bring forth the interpretive possibilities of actors towards modes of governing and can enhance our analysis of neoliberalism as a flexible, porous process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and extend heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Glynis George, for her knowledge, advice, and patience. I am grateful to my committee members, Dr. Max Hedley and Dr. Miriam Wright, for their time and effort in the completion of this thesis. I would also like to thank my mentor, Dr. Ivan Emke for his continuous friendship, advice, and support. I must acknowledge the staff of the Ferriss Hodgett Library, Sir Wilfred Grenfell College; especially Ms. Elizabeth Behrens, Associate University Librarian, for being so helpful during the collection of my Newfoundland sources. Finally, I'd like to thank my family: my sister, Jayme-Lee, for understanding the trials and tribulations of being a student; my partner, Corey, for his understanding, his unconditional love, and his friendship; my parents, Gary and Elaine, for their much needed motivation, love, and optimism. Lastly, I'd like to thank my late Grandmother, Evelyn, whose sense of humour and constant encouragement I will carry with me always.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.
INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines new forms of governing – particularly neoliberalism – in Newfoundland[1] and addresses the way governance discourses articulate with rural development[2] initiatives. To explore this question I draw on a governmentality approach which considers the techniques used by government to govern from afar. Governmentality is an analysis of governing and the modes of government that are used. As form of analysis, governmentality emerged from Foucault's (1991) investigation of historical writings about government. However, it has since been taken up by scholars such as Rose and Miller (1992), Dean (1999), and Rose, O'Malley, and Valverde (2006). Governmentality can mean how we think about governing and how we have historically thought about governing; therefore this approach examines how we govern and what modes of government we use. Thus, governmentality is a set of questions about governing (Rose, O'Malley, and Valverde 2006: 85).

This analysis foregrounds neoliberalism as a rationality used by governments to reinforce discourses of individual freedom and individual responsibilization, and is concerned with "new ways of allocating the tasks of government between the political apparatus, 'intermediate associations', professionals, economic actors, communities and private citizens" (Rose 1999: 140). According to Rose and Miller (1992), the central features of neoliberalism are the expansion of strategies that engender and sustain a

---

[1] Officially, the province is Newfoundland and Labrador. However, I will often refer only to 'Newfoundland' because I have concentrated on the Island portion of the province. Moreover, the literature cited in this study focuses on the Island as well.

[2] I use the term 'rural development' to refer to initiatives currently taking place in small Newfoundland communities. While some would specify these initiatives as 'community economic development', their concentration in rural communities and the small size of these communities, in Newfoundland has led to many referring to them as strategies for 'rural development'. Thus, it is a matter of location or where these initiatives are carried out.

market, and a shift in the forms of economic exchange towards contractual exchange (p.199). Moreover, neoliberal governments reassign responsibility and accountability from the state to the individual and community levels (Rose and Miller 1992; Dean 1999b; Rose 1999). Since states have shifted responsibility to individual and local organizations, private organizations and voluntary groups have taken over some of the responsibilities that were once managed by the state. This shift from government to governance (Murdoch and Abram 1998) has resulted from the 'problematization' of state governments which were seen as too involved in governing. Governance, according to Rose (1999), "is used as a kind of catch-all to refer to any strategy, tactic, process, procedure or programme for controlling, regulating, shaping, mastering or exercising authority over others in a nation, organization or locality" (p. 15).[3]

Thus, the focus of this thesis is to examine the extent to which new modes of governing are reflected in government policy and the way such policy is interpreted by social actors who partake in rural development[4] initiatives in a particular community. My examination of both policy and narratives is important because neoliberalism points to shifts in governing, particularly drawing on community and active citizenship. Newfoundland is a context where economic crisis and a sustained notion of community are prominent. Moreover, according to Herbert (2005), "[amid] the various discussions of the logic and operation of neoliberalism, the voices of citizens are rarely heard" (p. 852).

---

[3] Rose (1999) also defines 'governance' in more specific terms which highlight the interactions among different "political actors". He states: "governance refers to the *outcome* of all these interactions and interdependencies: the self-organizing networks that arise out of the interactions between a variety of organizations and associations" (p. 16-17).

[4] In order to define 'rural development', I have adapted Voth's (1975) definition of 'community economic development' as it is drawn upon in later debates about development in Newfoundland (House 2003). Thus, for the purposes of this study, 'rural development' is an attempt by rural people "to improve [their] social and economic [situations] through [their] own efforts using professional assistance and perhaps also financial assistance from the outside and involving all sectors of the community or group to the maximum" (Voth 1975: 148, cited in House 2003: 234).

Rural people are active subjects who draw on their own experiences to interpret development. Indeed, as I try to suggest, neoliberal governance is a construct which occurs as a polymorphous phenomenon that unfolds in myriad ways once it reaches those individuals who are expected to interpret and carry out governmental techniques for development.

My focus on the interpretation of social actors necessitates a synthetic and culturally informed approach to the analysis of neoliberal discourse. With respect to 'culture', previous research suggests there may be links between particular constructions of 'rurality' and the advancement of neoliberal policy in rural areas (Cloke and Milbourne 1992; Little and Austin 1996), but further exploration is needed to address how rural constructs are constituted in specific neoliberal initiatives in Newfoundland (see Byron 2003). The discourse of 'development' in Newfoundland and Labrador (see House 2003), although not the focus of this study, does attend to constructs of 'community', a topic to which I will return.

The nature of this research requires not only a critical discourse analysis (CDA), but also narrative interviews to assess how social actors interpret government policy. A critical discourse analysis locates neoliberal discourse in the government documents of Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador. Through narrative interviewing, I explore how social actors interpret neoliberalism in development initiatives.

The focus of this study is Goose Brook (a pseudonym), a community where the population has been declining. While, this is typical of rural Newfoundland, it is related to the collapse of the Northern cod stocks – historically an important industry in rural Newfoundland. Goose Brook is noteworthy for its attempts to address these problems

through various schemes for development. Of particular interest is the community's engagement with partnership, a popular tool in neoliberal governing. A key element to community development has been government funding. Thus far, Goose Brook has been able to secure a reported four million dollars worth of funding. This amounts to approximately $7,700 of funding per person.

There is some sense within the community that its been very successful and it is uncommon for small communities to receive this amount of funding. There are several examples of partnerships at play in Goose Brook, and one in particular I explore is a museum. Dedicated to preserving the "intangible cultural heritage" (see *Creative Newfoundland Labrador: The Blueprint for Developing and Investing in Culture* 2006*)* of the area, its features reflect the linkage between partnering culture and the market.

'Community success' is important in neoliberal discourse and achieved through partnership and responsibilization. According to Cheshire and Lawrence (2005), "[global] competition, self-reliance, and entrepreneurship are promoted by neoliberalism for communities who need to become part of the global world" (p. 437). The risks associated with not becoming active in the global market are conveyed to individuals and groups in such a way as to encourage them to self-govern in the 'appropriate' ways, ways which are dictated to them by the state. In neoliberal governing, responsibility and accountability is transferred from state agencies to individuals and social organizations (Rose and Miller 1992; Dean 1999b; Rose 1999). This shift to the individual and community level has fostered the growth of community groups and self-help programs. If community is the locus for neoliberal governance, then how are living communities, which in Newfoundland have long histories, incorporated into this governance?

Community has always been an important part of life in rural Newfoundland (Faris 1972; Mannion 1976; House, White, and Ripley 1989; Pocius 1991; Davis 2000; George 2000; Sinclair 2002). Kinship and neighbourliness are both historically relevant in outport Newfoundland and continue to be, even in this global era. People not only feel a sense of community that links them socially to their surroundings, but geographically people identify themselves as 'belonging' somewhere rather than 'being from' or 'living' somewhere.

Moreover, while governmentality has provided a useful approach for uncovering the elements of neoliberalism that are important in the Newfoundland context, many governmentality researchers dismiss agents' own voices and actions (see Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1996; Dean, 1999; Rose, O'Malley, and Valverde, 2006). As Rose, O'Malley, and Valverde note: "Foucault's earlier work...did not give priority to the subject that speaks" (2006: 90). Furthermore, they recognize the criticisms that suggest governmentality studies often neglect the role of subjects (p. 100). They state "[the] analytical tools developed in studies of governmentality are flexible and open ended. They are compatible with many other methods" (p.102). As Hacking (2004) suggests, we need two ways of examining discourse. The first is called 'top-down' and is derived from a Foucauldian approach. The second is called 'bottom-up' and stems from the work of Goffman. This approach allows for the examination of structures and institutions, as well as the roles of agents. Hacking asserts that "[the] two perspectives are complementary and both are necessary" (p. 278). What follows is an attempt to explore the relevance of a more ethnographic approach to such a framework because it offers interpretive possibilities.

II.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND THE NEWFOUNDLAND COMMUNITY

I have chosen to use a governmentality approach to examine neoliberalism – a fairly recent form of governing. Techniques such as accountability and responsibilization, partnerships, and community are used in the neoliberal template to operationalize self-governance, risk, and marketization – elements which relate closely to neoliberal discourses of individual freedom. In neoliberal discourse, accountability and responsibility are transferred from the state to the individual and community levels (Rose and Miller 1992; Dean 1999b; Rose 1999). No longer does the state hold itself responsible for all activities. Instead, local and private organizations and volunteers are managing previously state-sponsored initiatives. This has allowed the state to step back and govern from afar.

According to Dean (1999b), neoliberal governments utilize various techniques to govern individuals and groups from afar, one of which is freedom (p. 149). In governmentality studies, scholars such as Rose (1999) assert that people are freed by being governed; people are only free to the extent that they can self-govern in appropriate ways (p. 69). Self-governance is a technique used by governments to allow them to govern at a distance, but, it is also a desired outcome of government because it demonstrates individuals' acceptance of what is presented to them as 'appropriate' behaviour. Neoliberal discourse links self-governance with notions of individualization and responsibilization. The emphasis placed on choice and liberty is what gives human beings the ability to self-govern. However, we do so based on what is presented to us as 'normal' or civil behaviour. If we choose to not follow these 'normalities', we become problematized. One outcome of this problematization has been increased risk, especially

for those locales which have remained dependant upon the state (Giddens 1998; Beck 2000).

Rural areas have been subject to ever increasing withdrawal of state assistance and are now turning to individual and community responsibility and accountability through various programmes, many of which have been established by the state to encourage community involvement (Cloke, Milbourne, and Widdowfield 2000; Jones and Little 2000; MacKinnon 2002; Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004). People of these areas are increasingly engaging in partnerships with governmental agencies, non-governmental agencies, as well as experts in order to 'develop' to a point where they can actively participate in a competitive market economy that neoliberal discourse advances (Dean 1999b; Norcliffe 2005).

Rural people are expected to self-govern so they can 'help themselves' (Murdoch and Abram 1998: 42). However, not all communities have the resources to do so. Furthermore, "[there] is no obligation...that government provide resources and assistance to those groups who might want to participate but lack the capacity" (Sheldrick 2002: 135). Community self-sustainability has been presented as a 'normal' community responsibility and communities that have chosen not (or have been otherwise unable) to follow this 'normality' have been problematized. This is evident in rural instances where issues such as poverty, unemployment, and ill-health are problematized by larger state entities.

Since rural areas are largely resource-based, they have been problematized for not actively engaging in the market economy, which is characteristic of ever-occurring globalization. Thus, new programmes have been implemented to address the risks that

arise if rural locales do not evolve into market-based economies. The risks associated with resource-based industries has resulted in governments placing less value on those – as is the case in Newfoundland – and devoting more time to encouraging entrepreneurial activities and business skills development (ACOA 2003). This is evident in the rural context where high unemployment rates have been subject to different forms of governing (see Walters 2001). Rural areas have been targeted by government due to their riskiness and have been subject to the politics of community. Partnerships are concerned with transforming risky areas into self-governing, sustainable communities.

According to Giddens (1998), "[the] idea of risk is bound up with the aspiration to control and particularly with the idea of controlling the future" (p. 27); the idea is to prevent risk before it happens or to address at-risk populations so they are equipped with the tools to avoid becoming risky. Risk becomes a moral and social issue that is used as a technique for individual management (O'Malley 2002: 18). Furthermore, O'Malley asserts that individuals become their own "risk managers" (p. 26). Risk links individuals and their communities, thus making them accountable (Rose 1996: 349). In neoliberal discourse, risk management shifts onto the individual and community level.

Communities become responsible for managing risk, and according to Cheshire and Lawrence (2005), the politics of community plays on peoples' sense of "community spirit" (p. 441). Moreover, Giddens (1998) suggests that much of politics is now concerned with risk management; even risks which are not political in nature are being managed politically (p. 29). These management techniques are prescribed to rural areas that are expected to engage with and manage risks through an active citizenry. Hence, there becomes a division "between active citizens (capable of governing themselves with

minimal assistance) and targeted populations ('high risk' groups who require extensive expertise and tutelage)" (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004: 291). Thus, those who want to do better and seek advice from experts to do so are rewarded; those who fail to manage their risks are subject to withdrawal of services.

Rural areas are increasingly engaging in a form of governance which claims to be community based, or 'bottom-up', where community members and organizations are partnering with larger entities in the formation and implementation of policy. Power and knowledge still reside in the hands of larger state organizations, but this is masked by techniques of government that are used to govern at a distance. Sally Engle Merry (2001) asserts that one of these is the security technique of spatial governmentality, which focuses "on concealing or displacing offensive activities rather than individuals. Their target is a population rather than individuals" (p. 17) in the sense that preventative measures are taken so populations will avoid becoming risky through the ability of individuals to self-govern. Merry refers to these as "risk-based techniques" which work by "dividing the population into categories organized around differential degrees of risk" (p. 19).

Partnership is a key technique used by neoliberal governments to govern from afar. According to Jones and Little (2000), "partnership [is] a key component of the emergent process of governance and one which suffuses the governance culture" (p. 171). Partnerships encourage groups within the community to work with each other and state representatives in order to achieve a common goal. However, what the common goal may be is usually provided by the state and deployed as a norm which citizens take up. Murdoch and Abram (1998) state, "'[active] communities'...and 'active citizens'...are

now commonly evoked as new 'partners' of government" (p. 41). Partnerships are used by community groups who are trying to engage with the discourse presented to them by the state. Partnerships with government are designed to provide the community and its individuals with a sense of incorporation into the decision making process. However, this is a false sense of incorporation since power and control are usually retained by government. As Murdoch and Abram (1998) argue:

> While [communities] can be enrolled into programmes of government, their incorporation is usually on acutely constrained terms....[And] they are rarely invited into central arenas of policy formulation and they are not heard in many of the technical discourses which comprise the more specialized areas of planning (p. 49).

Partnership has been taken up by various governmentality theorists (Goodwin 1998; Murdoch and Abram 1998; Stoker 1998; Jones and Little 2000; MacKinnon 2000; Sheldrick 2002; Herbert 2005; Larner and Craig 2005) who debate the meaning of such partnerships, a topic to which I return by way of conclusion.

The transfer of responsibility and accountability to the individual and community level helps neoliberal governments ensure that communities and individuals will self-govern and manage risks appropriately. In the case of rural development, the ways in which communities choose to go about development often depends on the resources to which they have access. Citizens are left responsible for themselves, but in many instances they lack the resources to be responsible. Moreover, the state's desire to remain dominant in governing rural areas (even if from afar) hinders the ability of local people to work towards their own goals. In some instances, "localized groups can be asked to assume greater responsibility..., although often on terms greatly dictated by state agencies" (Herbert 2005: 851). Thus, government is providing the template of 'normal'

behaviour to which communities are expected to conform. If the communities fail or are less than successful, then they are at fault (Rose 1996; Cloke, Milbourne, and Widdowfield 2000; Cheshire and Lawrence 2005).

Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins (2004) suggest that "in order for communities to successfully take charge of their own development, they must first become enmeshed in a network of relations that assists them in acquiring the capacities to govern themselves responsibly" (p. 289). People will assume "responsibility for their own security and that of their families" (Rose 1996: 342). Moreover, this responsibility seeps out into the community; people are expected to understand that they are also responsible for their communities: "these are individualized subjects, but they already have specific ties to family and community" (Larner and Butler 2005: 85). Furthermore, people must become individuals who are responsible for themselves because government cannot be expected to provide for them (Cheshire and Lawrence 2005: 438). Thus, communities become "sites, sources and managers of risk" (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004: 300). Rose (1999) sums up these points:

> The state is no longer to be required to answer all society's needs for order, security, health and productivity. Individuals, firms, organizations, localities, schools, parents, hospitals, housing estates must take on themselves – as 'partners' – a portion of the responsibility for resolving the issues (p. 174).

Communities are thus transformed from physical spaces into responsible entities. It is at the community level where techniques of neoliberalism are exercised.

Governing through community involves creating a space where values and morals are used to govern in such a way as to influence individuals to better the community as a whole (Rose 1999: 172). For Rose, community is a space where state authority meets autonomous and free individuals. He says, "[in] the institution of community, a sector is

brought into existence whose vectors and forces can be mobilized, enrolled, and deployed in novel programmes and techniques which encourage and harness active practices of self management" (p. 176).

Technologies of community, Rose argues, have been implemented over the last 50 years in order to make community a reality (1999: 189). Expertise, knowledge, and truth claims are among many different techniques employed by government to govern from afar. With rural development,

> new 'experts of community' have been born, who not only invent, operate and market these techniques to advertising agencies, producers, political parties and pressure groups, but who have also formalized their findings into theories and concepts. These experts are now on hand to advise on how communities and citizens might be governed (Rose 1999: 189).

Since services previously offered by the state become the responsibility of the community, people are now members of a community, and thus they become obligated to those communities. This, in turn, allows the state to govern at a distance (Cheshire and Lawrence 2005: 441). States are governing from afar by governing *through* community and communities work together because they are often times rewarded with state moneys for doing so (p. 441). Community becomes a way to advance neoliberal discourse. Thus:

> The community...is not primarily a geographical space, a social space, a sociological space or a space of services, although it may attach itself to any or all organizations. It is a moral field binding persons into durable relations. It is a space of emotional relationships through which individual identities are constructed through their bonds to micro-cultures or values and meanings (Rose 1999: 172).[5]

However, community often cannot withstand many of the pressures placed upon it. As Herbert (2005) states: "community can give way under the expectations that neoliberalism wishes to place upon it; it often cannot fulfill the obligations the state seeks

[5] Rose acknowledges that community is not a monolithic term with limited boundaries; it is complex and works in myriad ways (1996: 332).

to offload. Community thus exists as a false floor, ready to collapse when laden with excessive political expectations" (p. 853).

A governmentality approach is useful in sketching the contours of community as a mode of governance; it pays less attention to the social terrain, the cultural ways which give community life and also shape actors' perspectives. Governmentality analysis is not reflected in the Newfoundland literature, but researchers have made parallel insights. For instance, MacDonald, Neis, and Murray (2007) have addressed the changes occurring in Atlantic Canada as a result of the neoliberal regime. They state: "[social] welfare is now couched in the language of economics and the market" (p. 5). The demise of the fishery, and the subsequent moratorium on cod fishing has provoked recent dramatic change which impacts on rural communities, including wide scale restructuring of social and economic programs (George 2000b). At the same time, debates about rural development have a long history in Newfoundland and rural communities have been conceptualized within these policies in ways which may still bear upon the present.

Newfoundland has quite often been referred to as Canada's 'have-not' province. Since Confederation, politicians, academics, bureaucrats, and citizens alike have been discussing ways to improve Newfoundland's economy. This is especially true of rural economies that have historically been dependant on resource-based industries. House (2003) sketches the evolution of development strategies beginning with the formation of the Fishermen's Protective Union (FPU) in 1908, and then moving to more recent tactics such as the creation of the Regional Economic Development Zones in the mid-1990s. Although House addresses many schemes for development, he notes that "[the] purest form of community-based economic development in post-Confederation Newfoundland

and Labrador occurred in the late 1960s and early 1970s" (2003: 228). During this era, which he specifies as the "rural development movement" (p.229), "[rural] development and small-scale industry, rather than urbanization and megaprojects, were to be the order of the day" (p. 228).

The Federal Government has also taken steps to address rural economies. The first measure was taken following the 1960 budget speech and came in the form of the Agricultural Rehabilitation Development Act or ARDA (Savoie 2003). ARDA, according to Savoie, "was an attempt to rebuild the depressed rural economy" (152). There were accusations that the program excluded fisheries resources, for instance, and in 1966, ARDA became the Agriculture and Rural Development Act (p. 152). That same year, the Fund for Regional Economic Development (FRED) was introduced and it served the purpose of concentrating on specific regions of Canada. According to Savoie, "[regions] of high unemployment and slow growth were the target of these measures" (p. 152). Later, under the direction of Prime Minister Trudeau, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (DREE) was formed and focussed on slow-growth areas (p. 153). In 1982, however, DREE was abandoned and replaced by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion (DRIE) (p. 155). Unfortunately, the Atlantic Canada Premiers were dissatisfied with DRIE and following debates with the Prime Minister, it was decided that DRIE would disband and be replaced by regional agencies in 1987 (p. 156). The first of these was in Atlantic Canada and is known as the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA). ACOA still exists today and will be discussed in detail in chapter IV.

Following the 1960s and 1970s many changes – both positive and negative – occurred in Newfoundland and Labrador development initiatives. Not unlike the national

attempts at creating departments aimed at development, there were several provincial departments created and abolished during the 1970s. Among these were the Department of Rural Development and the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council (House 2003: 229). During the 1990s, however, the term 'community economic development' (CED) came to the fore when the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador commissioned a Task Force on Community Economic Development in Newfoundland and Labrador. This Task Force was the motivating force behind the implementation of 17 (later 20) Regional Economic Development Boards across the province.

There has been much debate about the purpose of these boards, including how they are to meet their objectives. Many of these issues derive from lack of funding, but House notes that there are also social and cultural forces which may hinder the ability of the Boards' operation. For instance, he points to the historic connection Newfoundlanders often associate with their own communities and how this may negatively impact their ability to form collaborative regions within the province (p. 249). This notion of 'turf-wars' and competition among neighbouring towns is something to which I will return. In sum, as approaches to rural development have shifted in the last 50 years, *community,* its development, and the practices and understandings of Newfoundlanders as members of a community, has been implicated in, and impacted by, these policies.

Moreover, culturally, in terms of livelihood and social meaning, 'community' has been an important idiom, a social site for a historical period that precedes not only the neoliberal era, but others before it, that predate the formal 'rural development' strategies summarized above. Newfoundland communities, particularly rural outports, have

historically been based on systems of reciprocity; neighbours, friends, and kin have long been engaging in a system of informal give and take. Thus, the notion of community is not a new one to coastal communities which have a long history of mutual collective care and concern. As Sinclair (2002) notes, "[there] is a long tradition of co-operation in house construction and major repair" (p. 310). In rural Newfoundland, "outport life depends on cooperative, reciprocal relations between households. Such relations are a form of social capital, central to local economy and to the rural lifestyle" (Richling 1985: 241).

A critical approach to community, one that attends to this history is important to enhance the socio-cultural context in which neoliberalism unfolds and which may inform actors' narratives. Let me sketch the dimensions of community that emphasize reciprocity and the collective ethos to foreground the social meanings which, although arguably historically rooted, resonate with, and may be transforming, due to new forms of governing such as partnering and responsibilization.

'The Newfoundland Community'

Historically, depictions of community emphasized the interconnected and collective ethos of mutual care because every family member had his or her own role, "the household rather than the individual [constituted] the basic economic unit" (House, White, and Ripley 1989: 39). Brothers, fathers, and sons worked at sea while their female counterparts worked at home; everyone relied upon each other for survival. According to House, White, and Ripley (1989), "for rural Newfoundlanders...economic self-interest has to do with maximizing well-being within the context of the household and the community" (p. 4). People shared a sense of responsibility for everyone in the community and this is evident since "residents...[now] practise a form of job sharing to

ensure...that as many residents as possible qualify for unemployment insurance" (p. 52). House, White and Ripley go on to state that "people act collectively in an entirely rational manner so as to maximize community income and security" (p. 55).

This emphasis on total community well-being can be accounted for because historically, "communities were isolated and socially were tight-knit, emphasized cooperation and self-sufficiency" (Mannion 1976: 18). This sentiment is echoed *in the present.* In Davis's (2000) community study of Grey Rock Harbour, for example, where residents articulated: "'we all come up together, or we don't come up at all'" (p. 346). Community has historically shaped the values and morals of the people in rural outports and it was a sense of community that helped get people through the roughest of times. According to Popkin (1979), "individuals only starved or suffered if the entire community was endangered" (Popkin 1979, cited in Overton 2000: 32). By contrast, Gerald Sider draws attention to the power relations of class that underpinned Newfoundland fishing communities (Sider 1986). However, he too conjures this sense of community as a collective entity.

To move to the more recent period, social and economic differences within communities were exacerbated by the collapse of the cod fishery. The subsequent moratorium "displaced approximately thirty thousand people from the [fishing] industry" (Overton 1996: 2) and this has had severe consequences for the 'communities'[6] affected. Rather than working together, neighbours, families, brothers, and communities were now in competition for the work that remained. According to Davis (2000), people lost their sense of "togetherness" (p. 351). Hence, depictions of Newfoundland community as

[6] I have used quotations here because not only were physical communities affected, but the sense of community was also affected.

reciprocal are, of course, partial and arguably exemplify the romanticization of rural life that scholars note exits more broadly, for example, in the United Kingdom (see Cloke and Milbourne 1992; Little and Austin 1996).

Research has pointed to the romanticization of rural life in the form of a rural idyll and I would argue that it can be paralleled to constructions of rural life in Newfoundland. The rural idyll is a representation of rural life that has been created, negotiated, and sustained on the local, regional, and national levels and presents rural life as "happy, healthy and problem free...safely nestling with both a close social community and a contiguous natural environment" (Cloke and Milbourne 1992: 359). It "has been used to describe the positive images surrounding many aspects of the rural lifestyle, community and landscape, reinforcing at its simplest, healthy, peaceful and secure and prosperous representations of rurality" (Little and Austin 1996: 101). It emphasizes of tight-knit communities filled with caring people, masking poverty and deprivation. The rural idyll is a technique of disguising the problems of rural life. Indeed, rural areas are seen as a "secret land" (p. 361).

Newfoundland literature suggests that constructions of Newfoundland culture involve a distinct element specific to that culture (Overton 1996; George 2000; Chafe 2003). As Chafe (2003) notes, "[it] is only when people are massed together for the means of identification and absorption into a greater community that 'culture' becomes an issue" (p. 70). Furthermore, he goes on to suggest that "Newfoundland culture and identity perpetuate an 'imagined community' that offers comfort and belonging to the individual" (p. 70). Providing evidence in the form of folksongs and referencing Newfoundland scholars such as Patrick O'Flaherty and James Overton, Chafe

demonstrates how Newfoundland culture has been collapsed into this bounded entity that remains unchanged since Confederation in 1949. However, a sense of belonging, even if only to an 'imagined community' may be an important feeling for rural people who otherwise feel alienated in the global arena. Furthermore, as Overton (1996) indicates: "[for] those who do feel uprooted and uncertain[,] being part of an 'imagined community' may be comforting" (p. 60).

The literature suggests that Newfoundlanders share a common identity that is often based on the hardships endured in the past (Davis 2003: 184), and are often characterized as "[friendly], hospitable, and helpful[,]...hard workers" (p. 184). Identity is an important feature of life in rural Newfoundland through which people gain social meaning. These subjective interpretations are ignored by a governmentality approach that views identity largely as it is constituted. Indeed, freedom allows one to make choices that form his or her identity, but a governmentality framework only acknowledges the choices that exist in a particular mode of governing (Dean 1999a).

Davis' (2003) re-study for instance, shows how conflicting notions of community pervade contemporary Grey Rock. Community is both a site of division and reciprocity. For example, she argues that Newfoundlanders have taken the stereotypical characteristics of their identity and have used them to market their province in tourism (p. 184). However, Davis (2000) has also noted a change in people's views of their rural lifestyle. Between her first encounter in 'Grey Rock Harbour' – in the 1970s before the fisheries crisis – and her follow-up research in the 1980s during the fisheries crisis – she found that some residents changed their views on the benefits of living in rural Newfoundland (2000: 350).

In fact, "[there] are two broad constructions of Newfoundland fishery communities in existing accounts: as idyllic, rustic, egalitarian, industrious communities; and as marginally literate, unravelling, communities with a culture of poverty and dependence" (Neis 2000: 296). Still, despite the hardships endured by Newfoundlanders, House, White, and Ripley (1989) suggest that Newfoundland is still the preferred place of residence for people (p. 12). Perhaps people prefer Newfoundland because of the sense of community they believe it offers. Community has characterized Newfoundland since early settlement and the obligation people feel towards their communities and families has been a distinguishing feature of rural Newfoundland since its establishment.

Finally, the idea of the 'Real Newfoundland' was stressed by government in an attempt to persuade tourists to the area. Overton (1996) points out, "[community] spirit, neighbourliness and family responsibility are characteristics of Newfoundland that are quickly being re-discovered as government unload their responsibilities in a number of areas" (p. 56). But now, the 'Real Newfoundland': "a certain kind of rural Newfoundland, one which is idealized and romanticized...[where] the people are 'happy' [and] they have 'great community spirit'" (p. 106) is used by government to appeal to people and make them feel accountable for themselves and their communities. The focus on a particular setting, which follows, is an attempt to locate these broader constructions, to sketch what an ethnographic approach might contribute to our understanding of neoliberal expressions of community and its culturally shaped undercurrents.

III.
THE 'ETHNOGRAPHIC' SETTING: GOOSE BROOK

In 2004, I was an inexperienced undergraduate who had not yet conducted field work. I always had a deep interest in going out into the field and conducting qualitative research, but I was still caught off-guard when a professor at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College asked me to be his research assistant on a Canada-wide project studying rural economies. I took on the challenge and travelled to Goose Brook for the first time in the summer of 2004. When I arrived there, my first impression was a community in decline. However, I noticed that the people in the community seemed to exude an attachment to Goose Brook. This attachment was not necessarily towards the physical space called Goose Brook, rather it was the feelings elicited by living in a small, coastal community that seemed important to them. I began to wonder how and whether people in development shared these perceptions.

Community, in the conventional sense, communicates ideas of a physical space where people make their homes. However, community can also mean a feeling; a sense one feels when one belongs. Goose Brook is a community in the usual sense since it is a geographic space filled with people, their homes, and businesses. However, it is also a community in the contemporary sense as well, since the people of Goose Brook express a sense of community. Therefore, I refer to Goose Brook as a community both in the physical sense and in the social sense.

Located approximately 145km from St. John's, the provincial capital, Goose Brook is a mere 90 minute drive from Newfoundland's largest city. Goose Brook was first settled in 1675, but it was not until 1964 that it became incorporated. It was around that same time when the first Town Council was established. Today, Goose Brook has a

full Council consisting of a mayor, a deputy mayor, and five councillors. Two council members are also chosen to represent the Town on the community's Hope Committee, which I will discuss in chapter IV.

Since 2001, Goose Brook's population has declined 7.5%, from 560 in 2001, to 518 in 2006. (Statistics Canada 2002 & 2007). Moreover, the population is mature with over 52% of the population being over the age of 45 (Statistics Canada 2002). Education levels are low in the community, with only 33.3% of 20-34 year olds having any training beyond high school. Furthermore, 37.5% of individuals age 35-44, and 56.4% of individuals age 45-64, have not completed high school. Many individuals rely on government support through Income Support Assistance and Employment Insurance. In 2004, 11.2% of individuals received Income Support Assistance, while 53.3% received Employment Insurance (Heidi Ryan, Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency, personal communication, June 29, 2007). The unemployment rate of Goose Brook is 38.6% (Statistics Canada 2002). This is higher than the 21.8% unemployment rate of Newfoundland and Labrador and is drastically higher than the 7.4% Canadian unemployment rate in the same year. While this may sound dismal, Goose Brook has been able to accomplish much more than other communities comparable in size.

According to Statistics Canada (2002), the total experienced labour force for Goose Brook in 2001 was 210. The majority of individuals (43%) were employed in manufacturing and construction, while only 10% were employed in resource-based industries (Statistics Canada 2002). There is a local fish processing plant in Goose Brook which experienced major changes following the cod moratorium in 1992. In 1992, the company employed twice the employees and was processing 100% ground fish; 90% of

which was cod. With over 70 years experience, today they process 90% shellfish and employ six full-time workers and 30-35 seasonal workers (Jennifer Sheppard, GreenSeafoods, personal communication, December 7, 2007). 2001 census data indicates that only 50 of Goose Brook's residents worked full-time, year round in 2001, and their average income was $26,293. There were 230 people with earnings, and their average earnings were $13,903 (Statistics Canada 2002).

One of the first sights a visitor to Goose Brook is greeted with is the community RV Park and Outside Pond Walking Trail. Duck decoys, a floating fisherman, and a fountain decorate this beautiful pond which has a kilometre of boardwalk surrounding its circumference. It is not uncommon to see people fishing in the pond, enjoying its boardwalk, or swimming in the designated area. The community is surrounded by trees, but farther down the main road, there are areas where people have cleared land to build homes. Most of the homes are old, but there has been some development of newer homes, a few of which are located right next to the ocean and are owned by a foreign family. This family is from South Africa and has no ties to the community. My participants expressed concern that these people are not interested in Goose Brook's development because the community is only their summer getaway. Community residents estimate that these homes are worth millions of dollars. Local people do not have homes worth this much, but the homes they have are cosy nonetheless.

Farther into the community there is a fish plant, a gas station, and a grocery store. However, the 'for sale' sign located in one of the windows signals the decline that has been occurring. There is a community ball-field and a small playground. There are several churches in Goose Brook, yet the clergy are often unable to hold regular services

because the have to work up and down the coast to accommodate the declining populations.

The Town Office and Volunteer Fire Department share a building located in the heart of down town. This is where the stores and fish plant are also located. Just down the street is The Goose Brook Boat Building Museum. All of these landmarks are located on the water. Since rural Newfoundland was built around the sea, it is not uncommon to find important structures located near the beach. There is a community wharf with splitting tables upon which men fillet their fish. However, that is an uncommon sight these days with the food fishery only being opened for a couple of weeks a year. Although they are not putting their boats off or cleaning their catch, you can still see men by the water during the day. They could be talking about the weather or days gone by, but the sense of longing to be out on the ocean lingers in the air.

As a Newfoundlander I am privy to this sort of information. I grew up in the 1990s and during that decade the cod moratorium was at the fore of all discussions surrounding Newfoundland. I grew up in an inland town where the local industry was pulp and paper. My father was not a fisher, nor was my grandfather. In fact, I do not know any relatives who were fishers. Nonetheless, I am familiar with the discourse surrounding Newfoundland's loss. So, while I do know certain things because of my status as a Newfoundlander, I still consider myself an outsider when visiting Goose Brook. I have visited Goose Brook four times – all on academic business – and like other outsiders I had to get past the gatekeepers and build a rapport with my participants.

Fifteen years have passed since the moratorium was first announced and it is not uncommon to turn on VOCM Radio and still hear the older generations calling in to the

open line show and talking about the fishery. There are also times when the local news will run a story on the fishery and they will talk with former fishers and rehash (or at least make public) the old memories of working at sea.

My own feelings as an outsider suggest to me that something is missing from Goose Brook. Perhaps the boarded up take-out or the 'for sale' sign at the local grocery store signal the decline of the community. Perhaps my own experience as a Newfoundlander does not allow me to approach the community objectively and my interpretations are spoiled by what I have heard on the radio or in the news. Or, perhaps my feelings are informed by the sense of loss I get from the rural people I observe. Whatever the case, most Newfoundland outports signal the same feelings of loss and longing for days gone by.

In 1497, Newfoundland was founded by John Cabot who returned to Europe with tales of Newfoundland's wealth of cod fish. In the centuries that followed, European fishers began making their way to the new world and Newfoundland's abundance of Northern cod made it an attractive location to carry out a migratory fishery. Like most – if not all – rural outports in Newfoundland, Goose Brook was settled because of its proximity to the ocean. In the seventeenth century, settlements began to spring up all along Newfoundland's coast. According to Otto Tucker, a Newfoundland historian, "early English settlement grew out of the salt codfish trade between the West Country and Newfoundland mercantile firms" (1997: 25). However, like most Newfoundland outports, Goose Brook soon "changed from a migratory fishing station used primarily in the summer to a permanent settlement" (Pocius 1991: 33). According to Sir John Berry, Goose Brook's first recorded settlement was in 1675; at the time there were 43 residents:

three planters and their 40 workers (1675: 4). Like other outport communities, the economy was a mixed one with the inshore fishery, and subsistence activity which "was supplemented by some involvement in the Labrador fishery and by fall and winter woods work" (Bates 1994: 599). Men were considered "jacks of all trades" and according to Faris (1972), "ideally, every man cuts his own wood, builds his own boat, builds his own lobster pots, mends his own traps and nets" (p. 45). Women also occupied various roles. However, as Davis (2000) notes, "[a] land/sea division of labor defines the respective natures of men's and women's work" (p. 344). But, she continues: "[relations] between fisher husbands and wives were largely complementary, the husband being responsible for fishing and care of the outside of the house and the wife for managing the household and the family. Yet, it is important to note that women played important instrumental roles and expressive roles in the fishery" (p. 346). In earlier times women worked on the shores preparing, drying, and salting fish; in the later years they "processed fish and contributed wages to family incomes" (p. 346).

Goose Brook continued to grow after 1675. Records indicate that the population increased to 261 in 1836 (1836: n.p.) and later grew to 787 in 1891 (Newfoundland Colonial Secretary's Office 1891: 68) – this represents a 300% increase in less than 30 years. In 1921, Goose Brook's population peaked at 1,098 (Newfoundland Colonial Secretary's Office 1921: 80) and then declined following the Great Depression. However, the community recuperated and began to grow again in the mid-1970s. Unfortunately, the growth was not long-lived, and by 1981 the population fell to 753 from the 796 recorded in 1976 (Statistics Canada 1981: 1-34.). The population has continued to decline ever since.

In spite of these difficulties, the citizens have been working to overcome out-migration and are attempting to develop the community so it does not face the same fate as many other rural outports (i.e. becoming bedroom communities, cottage communities, or all out resettlement). Developing the community has involved appealing to government for various sorts of moneys (i.e. Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency funding; Small Craft Harbours funding; Heritage Canada funding; etc.) that are used to support projects which are beneficial to the community's economic well-being. Long hours on the part of volunteers certainly have a role in Goose Brook's success with receiving funding, but countless rural communities have dedicated volunteers who spend numerous hours working towards the betterment of their communities. While their volunteer base is important, I suggest that Goose Brook's 'success' also derives from the knowledge some have acquired of the inner workings of government. On the surface, development workers in Goose Brook exemplify the successfully responsibilized entity neoliberal governments expect. However, underneath that facade is a well adjusted group of individuals who have learned to manipulate neoliberal policy to their advantage.

This 'success' is reflected in the management of The Goose Brook Boat Building Museum which was established in 1997. Once the old United Church School, this large two story building was purchased by an ex-patriot who sold it to the town for one dollar to house the Museum. The second floor of the Museum has all the original architecture, including beautifully detailed ceilings, and is home to countless artefacts and a genealogy room, where the community's entire kinship history – dating back to 1675 – is located. The artefacts in the Museum were once collected by children for a school project, but were later relocated to the Museum where most of them remain on loan from their

owners. My favourite piece is a horse-drawn hearse with sleigh runners which was used for winter burials. The existence of such a piece speaks to the hard winters the people of Goose Brook had to endure.

The first floor of the Museum is dedicated to the traditional art of boat building. Boat patterns, templates, make and break engines, and various other traditional tools are used in the construction of traditional boats. In the summers, young and old alike build the traditional boats in the Museum's boat building room using only the tools of their ancestors. The main floor was planned by a professional exhibit designer and, after the completion of the exhibits, a digital video system was wired. The people involved in the Museum are hopeful that one day they will use this technology to broadcast their museum on the internet. This would open their market and bring in more revenue.

The Museum is very important to the community. It provides summer work for the local students, as well as seasonal (sometimes full-time) employment for one, maybe two other employees. The Museum is involved in preserving the intangible cultural heritage of boat building, and is also involved with the local Heritage Board which is concerned that local tradition will be lost. Working together, their interest is in preserving this culture, while simultaneously using the Museum as an attraction for tourists.

The Museum and Heritage Board have partnered with various other community groups to form the Hope Committee, an arrangement I discuss in greater detail in the following chapter. However, to what extent do these arrangements that govern the Museum reflect neoliberal responsibilization and governing at a distance? How do local actors who participate in these partnerships understand their roles in addressing community development? To uncover the character of 'success,' I situate neoliberal

policy in the context of Goose Brook and draw on actors' voices in a methodological orientation that I will discuss in the next section.

A Multi-Perspectival Approach to the Setting

While my stay in Goose Brook was brief, I am trying to capture its ethnographic dimensions and this includes a multi-perspectival analysis. This approach parallels Hacking (2004), who argues that an attention to micro-dynamics (such as Goffman's) offers a necessary compliment to Foucault's abstract register of analysis. Hence, I employ critical discourse analysis to the examination of government documents and narrative analysis to qualitative interviews.

Analyzing Texts

Critical discourse analysis focuses on the relationships between texts, discursive practices, and larger social contexts. I used Fairclough's approach to CDA which is centred on the notion that discourse is constitutive of and constituted by social practices and structures (Phillips and Jørgensen 2002: 65). Fairclough's is a text-oriented method which attempts to merge detailed textual analysis, macro-sociological analysis, and micro-sociological analysis (p. 65). He approaches discourse as contributing to identity, social relations, and systems of knowledge (p. 67).

My discourse analysis was three-tiered and began with the selection of ten provincial and federal documents. These documents promote a neoliberal project, but were selected in consultation with a personal contact from the Provincial Rural Secretariat who deemed these important. Federal documents were selected from the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency webpage as well as Canadian Heritage's

webpage. These particular departments were chosen because they are important funding sources for Goose Brook.

The first tier documents were taken and carefully examined to form the second step of analysis. The documents analyzed in the second tier of my discourse analysis ranged from parliamentary reports to handbooks for individuals and groups, and guides to programs and services. The majority of these documents display characteristics of neoliberal discourse in the provincial and federal governments exemplified by the dominance of keywords such as: 'responsible', 'accountable', 'partnership', 'risk', 'the market' and 'community'. The purpose of the second tier of analysis was to understand just how deeply the neoliberal discourse runs in the government publications and to select which handful of documents would best suit the third step of analysis. This cursory, second tier analysis led to the selection of four documents which I examined in-depth – in the third tier of analysis – by adapting Fairclough's approach to textual analysis (see Fairclough 2003). Moreover, I chose the documents I believe best relate to the situation in Goose Brook.

I looked at the following documents in my second tier of analysis (see appendix A for detailed citations):

Federal documents:

- *Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: Five Year Report to Parliament 1998-2003*;
- *Building a 21st Century Economy, Together: A Guide to the Programs and Services of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency*;
- *A Profile of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency*;
- *Programs and Services for Heritage Organizations in Canada* and;
- *Canadian Heritage in Newfoundland and Labrador*

Provincial documents:

- *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador: The Blueprint for Developing and Investing in Culture*;
- *Final Report Evaluation of Facilitating Community Partnerships – Pilot Project Rural Secretariat – Eastern Region*;
- *Marking Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006*;
- *From the Ground Up* and;
- *Collaborating with Community: Introduction, Rationale, and Guide for Government*

Of these, I chose to focus on the following four: *Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: Five Year Report to Parliament 1998-2003*; *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador: The Blueprint for Developing and Investing in Culture*; *Marking Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006* and; *Collaborating with Community: Introduction, Rationale, and Guide for Government.*

A critical discourse analysis of these documents included a detailed examination of the keywords and a further examination which required asking certain questions of the documents. My search for terms such as 'partnership', 'risk,' 'accountability' and 'responsibilization', 'economy' and 'society', and 'the market' was informed by these questions: 'What are the keywords? And how do they appear in relation to other words?'; 'How does the text relate to the events, the wider world, and those involved?'; 'How is the text framed?'; 'How are agency and social actors represented?' (Fairclough 2003).

The final step of the analysis was in-depth and proved useful for uncovering how the government communicates neoliberal discourse to its audience. This step also provided prompts that would be useful during the interview process to elicit narratives of rural development. Simply examining text is not sufficient for the analysis of how power and structures shape practices – people are involved in creating rules of everyday practices. Moreover, as Atkinson (1999) suggests, "all organisations have...rules of practice...which are discursively constituted and reproduced over time" (p. 61). CDA

recognizes the importance of examining how texts are not only produced, but also consumed. In order to analyze social practices, an interview process was carried out with five individuals who have been involved in development efforts in Goose Brook.

Personal Narratives

I approached my interviews using Holstein and Gubrium's (1995) notion of the "active interview" to draw out my participants' narratives of rural development. My interviews were not structured in the traditional sense, meaning I did not follow a specific set of questions. Instead, I asked my participants to tell me their story of how they got involved in rural development. I prompted them using neoliberal buzzwords and asked them to expand on neoliberal concepts they expressed. I attempted to introduce sub-themes to generate a dialogue on 'development' and 'community' between myself and the respondent. I did not present the documents to my participants, but they were often aware of the existence of the publications.

After completing my interviews, I transcribed them for analysis. However, unlike typical interviews, much of the coding was done actively – during the entire interview process (p. 56). I set out to uncover the 'whats' and 'hows' of each person's narrative. Since participants were invited to construct their worlds as they experience them (Gubrium and Holstein 2002: 14), I had to be aware of the standpoints they took in their narratives. Narratives are not objective; they are subjective accounts provided by a single person and for that reason they need to be analyzed based on positionality: "[the] analysis of personal narratives can illuminate 'individual and collective action and meanings, as well as the process by which social life and human relationships are made and changed' (Laslett 1999: 392)" (cited in Riessman 2002: 697).

After carrying out a CDA of both provincial and federal government documents, I conducted "active interviews" (Holstein and Gubrium 1995) with male and female participants. Engaging in CDA before conducting interviews was crucial since it provided me with some of the background knowledge required to elicit narratives related to rural development. I engaged with active respondents as "narrator[s] of experiential knowledge" (Holstein and Gubrium 1995: 30).

I engaged in narrative interviews with five participants involved in Goose Brook's development. My goal was to obtain narratives from my participants: three women – Drew, Jamie, and Ann – and two men – Bob and Louis (all pseudonyms). The participants were chosen based on their experience with development in Goose Brook. Due to previous research, there was already a rapport with four of these participants and the fifth participant had been aware of the ongoing research and was willing to participate in this study. Ann, Bob, and Louis are volunteers of all ages and Drew and Jaime are the Museum's paid staff.

All of these participants were chosen based on a rapport I had built with them over the last three years as a research assistant for a professor at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College. As an undergraduate student, I traveled to Goose Brook – sometimes with my professor, other times without. I initially approached my participants during a visit to Goose Brook in the early summer of 2006.

I have a good relationship with Bob, and at the Annual Canadian Rural Revitalization Foundation Fall Conference we both attended in October 2006, I asked if he would be willing to sit down for an interview. He was so excited that he did not want to wait to get back home to Newfoundland. Bob, his wife, and I sat around his hotel room

in Gatineau, Quebec, the following afternoon and the interview was conducted while looking out over the Ottawa River. When I went to Goose Brook in November 2006 to conduct my other interviews, Bob and his wife opened their home to me and I stayed with them during my visit. Knowing what my research was about, Bob suggested that I contact Louis. I did, and that same night Louis invited me to his home to conduct my final interview. Earlier that day I had met with Drew and Jamie in their office and that is when Ann arrived. Although not initially chosen as a participant, she proved to be a valuable source.

This research was carried out over a nine month period extending from August 2006 to March 2007. The critical discourse analysis was ongoing over the entire period, while the interviews occurred in October and November 2006.

IV.
NEOLIBERAL DISCOURSE AND INTERPRETATIONS OF GOVERNANCE

I begin with the critical discourse analysis of government documents which reveals government's use of neoliberal techniques and arrangements in governing rural development. I then move to narratives which illustrate how participants in rural development understand and negotiate these techniques. Together, these analyses convey that neoliberal discourse is strongly at play in this community and is also taken up by social actors. However, as I try to argue, it is a contested process which requires discussion and further study. The critical discourse analysis that follows in the first section draws your attention to and illustrates the importance government documents have placed on neoliberal tactics such as partnership, the market, the economy, and community. The narratives that follow demonstrate how these strategies are interpreted in a particular Newfoundland community. The outcome of the critical discourse analysis and the narrative interviews allows for links to be made between a government generated discourse and a more specific context in which participants are engaged. Conducting analyses using these two very different but complementary forms for investigation allows for the examination and discussion of the general development of Newfoundland, as well as the particular situation in Goose Brook.

Governing from a Distance: Culture, Marketing, and Development

An initial cursory analysis of all documents revealed there is an underlying neoliberal agenda in government projects for development. The most common neoliberal characteristics are the ideas of partnership and collaboration, the economy, accountability and responsibility, risk, and the global market. Of significant importance is the way these keywords interact with one another to form a neoliberal discourse which engages

common themes such as community, culture, and self-governance. Indeed, on their own, these keywords do very little. Rather, it is their interconnectedness, their relationship with one another that suggests a neoliberal discourse exists.

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: An Example of Federal Texts

My analysis of ACOA, an important funding body for the region, indicates that neoliberal discourse exists on a larger scale in Canada and is therefore not peculiar to Newfoundland and Labrador. ACOA's existence is indicative of a set of federal-provincial relations that uses neoliberal techniques to specifically target Atlantic Canada – a segment of the country where the resource-based industry of fishing was once ubiquitous. An in-depth CDA was carried out on *Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: Five-Year Report to Parliament 1998-2003*. This is an 86 page document divided into four sections: "The Agency", "ACOA at Work", "ACOA Perspectives", and "Technical Appendix on Methodology and Approach". This document reveals what ACOA is about and works with the keywords in the neoliberal toolkit, including: 'entrepreneurship', 'innovation', 'community economic development', 'tourism', as well as the Agency's future. The document is about what ACOA is doing to fulfill its mandate, how the Agency is changing; it outlines the programs and services offered by ACOA, offers success stories and success rates, and sketches its path for the future.

My examination seeks to uncover the rules of engagement ACOA sets for the people it funds. What neoliberal techniques they employ, and how they employ them are vital pieces of information that can be used to compare how the discourse appears on paper and how the people of Goose Brook interpret and engage with it. ACOA's *Five Year Report to Parliament* deploys neoliberal buzzwords such as 'partnership' and

'accountability', and neoliberal practices like measuring success, assessing success, and auditing demonstrate the depth of neoliberal strategies in development initiatives.

For example, economic development is the key objective of ACOA and the keyword 'economic' appears nearly 200 times in this report. The Agency takes partial responsibility for developing opportunities in Atlantic Canada but stresses that in order to reach maximum international competitiveness, ACOA must share responsibility and accountability with various partners. Articulating keywords such as 'accountability' and 'the economy' together illustrates how governance has changed. The economy has always been a key concern among governments, but how it is articulated with community, for instance, suggests a neoliberal form of governance has come to the fore. In the Minister of State's Message, Gerry Byrne states: "ACOA has also increased its efforts to strengthen community economic development and to expand its partnership with the private sector, research institutions and provincial governments, particularly in the areas of innovation, research and tourism" (ACOA 2003: n.p.). Moreover, ACOA believes that "[in] fulfilling its mandate to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, the Agency continues to be guided by the principle that Atlantic Canadians should be encouraged to take greater responsibility for this development, with the federal government as a partner" (p. i). Furthermore, those receiving ACOA's aid are held accountable through techniques such as follow-up surveys, evaluation reports, and other methods which measure success. ACOA refers to these processes as 'results-based management' and evaluations are carried out and measured using success criteria: "ACOA has made reporting, accountability, transparency and protecting the public interest the cornerstones of its results-based

management approach to program planning, implementation, monitoring, audit and evaluation" (p. 5).

Particular attention is paid to business skills development and training for work in a global, knowledge-based economy. In an attempt to move out of traditional resource-based industries, ACOA encourages innovation, use of technology, investment in tourism, and increased global competition. 'Business' is a keyword in this document and is mentioned more than 300 times. This is indicative of the emphasis ACOA places on it as well as entrepreneurship, which appears over 100 times. This is especially true of ACOA's attempts in rural areas, which have historically been dependant on natural resources. The Strategic Community Investment Fund (which is one of ACOA's funding projects) focuses "on rural communities, and on initiatives that help communities adopt new technologies, improve their industrial competitiveness, and develop selective infrastructure identified as being beneficial to their economic success" (p. 13). Special attention is paid to rural areas with 65% of ACOA's loans under the Business Development Program going to places outside of metropolitan areas (p. ii). ACOA has also paid particular attention to youth and young people; especially rural youth. The Agency has implemented a Youth Ventures Program which is "designed to promote entrepreneurial awareness among the young people of Newfoundland and Labrador and to build a stronger bridge between the education system and the business world" (p. 24). Here we see a blurring of the lines between social (education) and economic (the business world).

While ACOA accepts only partial responsibility for the success and smooth operation of their programs and services, they grant government the full authority of

creating an advisory board. The Minister can make recommendations, but government has the final say on who will advise. The document states that "board members are appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister responsible for ACOA" (p. 3). This comes in the face of statements that argue government's role is limited (p. 8), yet the advisory board decides who to fund (p. 12).

In terms of Community Economic Development, partnerships and resposibilization remain keywords, but an empowerment discourse is also present. By working with various partners, ACOA would like for rural people to take ownership of their communities and become empowered in the process. The document states:

> ACOA's [community economic development] CED objectives are to: strengthen the co- ordination and co-operation between the Atlantic CED partners; increase the availability of business capital in rural communities; create sustainable jobs in these communities; strengthen the community strategic planning process; and encourage community ownership and empowerment in CED activities (p. 34).

ACOA recognizes the importance of social development. However, they only support social development initiatives when it will make positive economic contributions. They state:

> Increasingly, economic development overlaps with social development in communities. ACOA's mandate is economic development, but often this cannot work well without engagement in issues that have a social aspect. In its 2003 Budget, the Government of Canada signalled a re-emphasis on social programs and ACOA will support this where economic applicability can be demonstrated (p. 69).

The document relates to projects carried out by ACOA in Atlantic Canada to improve economic conditions in that region. While social conditions are mentioned, they are not significantly addressed in this document. The things that are said in the document are encouraging for people involved, but what is left unsaid may have a larger impact on those concerned. For instance, criteria that eliminate people from being eligible for

ACOA's myriad pots of funding are not discussed and the text is framed to address the positive impact the programs and initiatives carried out by ACOA have had in Atlantic Canada. I pose the question, how is a similar neoliberal discourse produced at the provincial level? It is best reflected in the document *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador: The Blueprint for Development and Investment Culture* (2006), to which I will now turn.

Newfoundland Culture: Commodity or Tradition?

This 55 page document, beautifully decorated with colourful pictures of art, landscape, and scenes of Newfoundland, is a clear reflection of neoliberal discourse. It is particularly noteworthy for its emphasis on heritage, culture, Newfoundland identity, and the market. There are terms which are interconnected and bear a relationship to the neoliberal template. For example, 'heritage' is a keyword mentioned nearly 150 times. The same is true of the term 'culture' which appears almost 100 times. That is minimal compared to the over 400 times that the word 'cultural' is articulated with other words to form terms such as 'cultural resources', 'cultural participation', and 'cultural workers'. The document establishes the *Blueprint*, the strategy for making Newfoundland a creative place, and techniques for implementing and monitoring the *Blueprint*'s strategy, and citizen's feedback. The document begins by pointing to Newfoundland's 'cultural resources', explains the problem/challenge, and then continues by making recommendations to overcome the problem and reach the objective.

To achieve its objective of 'cultural vibrancy', readers of the document are encouraged to invest in heritage and culture. The document emphasizes the social and economic benefits. Interestingly, of all instances when the terms 'social' and 'economic'

articulate (i.e. 'social and economic' or 'economic and social'), the social benefits are promoted prior to the economic benefits a full 76% of the time. Although the pairing arguably underscores a linkage that could support the neoliberal template by connecting social needs to economic ones, the social relations of culture (passing on folklore or a way of life) are conveyed as a cultural sector, an economic venture with both social and economic benefits.

Much of the vocabulary used is jargon (i.e. 'intangible cultural heritage'); however, the government attempts to overcome possible literacy barriers by appealing to people's sense of place and identity (i.e. 'who we are') in a way that conveys a patriotic tone. This indicates to me the document is directed towards all citizens of the province. In his message Premier Danny Williams states:

> *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador: The Blueprint for Development and Investment in Culture* provides a framework of major policies and directions to guide the Government and our partners as we work together to celebrate our identity and move forward as a creative, confident and vibrant society and economy. To do so will require making some choices about how we preserve, protect and develop our strong cultural resources and assets both now, and over the longer term (Newfoundland and Labrador 2006: 5).

This document attempts to secure social agency; it wants people to take responsibility for their culture, heritage, identity, and community, and pursue those things with an economic agenda, in particular, the marketization of culture. Neoliberal discourse connects the social and economic terrains. People are encouraged to recognize both social and economic benefits of the programs initiated by government and, thus, carry out economic and social ventures which have become interconnected. Premier Williams states: "we know that we must support and encourage creative people, especially our professional artists, and keep up with technological advances and enable our cultural

professionals to be competitive on a global level" (p. 5). Here we see a linking of social (culture) and economic (the market).

The aim is to turn Newfoundland culture into a business – make it a product, a commodity that can be bought and sold on the market. The document states:

> Many now recognize that culture and creativity are not isolated, self-contained phenomena. They weave throughout our society and economy....The creations, activities and productions of professional artists and other cultural workers, cultural industries and businesses, and cultural organizations and institutions altogether generate an extensive web of economic activity. In 2003, Statistics Canada reported that the province's cultural sector produced approximately $289 million in output, accounting for 2% of provincial Gross Domestic Product (p. 11).

Marketization on a global scale is achieved not solely through government, but it is transferred to volunteers and heritage workers. Government "alone cannot overcome all of these hurdles, but it can and will do more than it has to date. Government will create a framework within which all players, applying their various strengths, can work to help address these challenges" (p. 11). The document also makes truth claims which insist that artistic expression will improve health, education, and other social issues:

> Artistic productions frequently are the source, directly or indirectly, or considerable economic activity and wealth. Whether this outcome occurs or not, artists generally work at their art for the love of it, for the meaning and fulfillment it provides. And just as artistic impression gives meaning and fulfillment to the artist, it also contributes importantly to enhanced health, education, quality of life and communal identity in our society as a whole (p. 19).

Here we see a blurring of lines between what is considered social and what is considered economic.

The relationship between culture and marketing is also explored through tourism. Newfoundland tourism has evolved, and in the early years Overton (1980) suggested that Newfoundland's tourism relied on "publicity consisting of romantic and picturesque

images of the rural areas of the province" (p. 115). *Marking Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006*, a recent tourism marketing guide was analysed in this study. This document is divided into sections which echo neoliberal strategies of government: "Strategic Compass & Creative Platform", "Touring and Explorer Market", "Activity Markets Marketing Programs", "All Markets Marketing Programs", and "Partnership Programs Guidelines". It is not unusual to profile tourism as an economic venture, but the way in which the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador proposes to market the province is unusual. They have insisted that creating Newfoundland and Labrador as a brand consisting of "three pillars" – culture, people, and natural environment – will entice tourists to come to the province. They state: "Creativity...will be used to clearly communicate what Newfoundland and Labrador has to offer as a travel destination. Creativity defines who we are, what we do, and how we live. Creativity is relevant to our target markets" (Newfoundland and Labrador 2006: 2).

Newfoundland, according to this document, is a unique destination because of its creativity. The three pillars are inviting because they engage people on an emotional level and leave them with pleasant feelings of the province. Government believes that "people don't buy 'products'; they buy benefits. The real benefit lies several layers below the tangible tourism 'product' – in the emotion of the brand, and the feelings it evokes" (p. 6). This strategy is what takes neoliberal discourse beyond partnership; this strategy creates an economic venture of out Newfoundland's culture and way of life. By stereotyping Newfoundland and Labrador's people as friendly, hospitable, and humorous, the government attempts to capitalize on the province's identity. For instance, 'who we

are' and 'this place we call home' are particular examples of how the government creates a commodity out of the province and its people. They state:

> While the content of the advertising will feature our unusual tourism products, icons, locations, and experiences, the advertising will not be 'about' products. The creative strategy is to elicit an emotional response – a 'feeling' about this unique place we call home. And it's this difference that will make all the difference in securing a competitive advantage for Newfoundland and Labrador (p. 8).

The document emphasizes the importance of partnership and participation: "[your] participation is key to promoting the continued growth and vitality of tourism in Newfoundland and Labrador" (p. 3). It asks for financial and in-kind support in its marketing activities, in effect responsibilizing the people of the province. They suggest: "[you] can participate by sharing costs or in-kind contributions with Newfoundland and Labrador Tourism" (p. 27). Unlike other documents, this one supplies contact information for various representatives and encourages the reader to contact them with information and/or support they could lend. This suggests the document is directed towards an audience that is currently involved in, or interested in becoming involved in the tourism sector. Partnership and support from the people is essential if the province is to compete in a global market. The document lists challenges to Newfoundland's tourism operation, but insists that if they target the right market, the province will be able to compete regionally, nationally, and internationally. Marketing is a key concept in this document and this keyword was used approximately 200 times, significant given that the document is only 38 pages.

The importance of community as a vehicle for governing at a distance is best reflected in the third provincial document *Collaborating with Community*. Here, community is a node for partnerships that constitute neoliberal governing arrangements

and which foreground Goose Brook's development strategies. Moreover, the origins of this text in the Women's Policy Office suggests an interpenetration of social and economic issues. It arguably reflects the depth of neoliberalism's entry into the social or it challenges the centrality of neoliberalism, an issue to which I will return in my conclusion.

Community Collaboration: A Provincial Perspective

Collaborating with Community: Introduction, Rationale, and Guide for Government (2003) was prepared by the Women's Policy Office, a branch of the government's executive wing, in partnership with government and community. It provides a generic template for partnership, a how-to for community collaboration, which evolved from the Violence Prevention Initiative. This initiative is a five year plan linking government and community in an attempt to address the causes of violence. It evolved from the Strategy Against Violence and the Strategic Social Plan. Its generic character is evidenced in the way it seeks to teach groups that in order to see changes, they must communicate shared goals and values; they need to create bonds that will allow them to develop plans that will work in the long-term. In order for this to work, groups must respect different views and the inclusion of all stakeholders will allow partners to use community collaboration as a tool, a process for success. The document says:

> The relationship between government and community groups is changing. It is no longer acceptable for government to 'just' consult with the community on the important issues affecting them. Government and community must work together collaboratively to make real changes (p. 17).

The Initiative references other strategies (i.e. The Strategic Social Plan, the Royal Commission) that have collaborative dimensions to centre *collaboration* in the operation of neoliberal governance.

The document references 'action', 'inclusion', 'exclusion', 'participation', and 'isolation' a total of 46 times. It stresses the importance of 'community participation' and sees control as lying in the hands of all those involved:

> Underlying this rationale of Community Collaboration [is] an acknowledgement that government does not have all the pieces of the puzzle. Therefore, it needs to collaborate with the people who have different pieces of that same puzzle – pieces just as credible and often based on front-line experience. Community will identify to government policies that aren't working as well as they could be because they were developed in isolation of communities, group and other departments (p. 9).

Having said that, however, it finds value in appointing a "team leader" so community collaboration efforts remain focussed on finding solutions to their particular issues.

Governments are increasingly governing through inclusion by calling on communities to take ownership of their issues and become responsible for influencing the issues they face. Take the following quotation for example:

> There have been many other attempts to integrate voices outside of government in policy development. Royal Commissions, public hearings, ministerial advisory committees, roundtables, individual consultations, legislative committees and public opinion polls are all tools of government to hear opinions and recommendations on policy development. From the perspective of community groups, many of these consultations were exclusionary and superficial. While often providing the opportunity to present their views, rarely did the opportunity present itself to remove the "we/they" nature of these processes (p. 9).

Violence prevention is in itself a neoliberal technique that has been designed to make communities more autonomous and responsible for issues once taken care of by welfarism. Prevention and early intervention are techniques that mask economic endeavours by using volunteer groups to address issues such as spousal abuse and violence, rather than having victims and/or offenders treated by professionals and costly government services.

The idea of respecting different perspectives and including all stakeholders with an equal voice appears, at first glance, to be a step in the right direction for community participation in dealing with social issues and addressing policy concerns. However, a critic would call into question the necessity the document places on shared values and common objectives. Allowing only those with common goals to participate is exclusionary. The document states:

> The selection of groups in a Government and Community Collaboration should not include those who have opposing values on the issue for consideration, and whose intent is to debate the underlying principles of the policy as they will never get beyond the "Agreement on Values" Step of the process (p. 10).

When it comes to selecting the leader of a collaborative team, the criteria listed in the guide excludes community members almost from the start. For instance, the document states that the lead person must "understand the nature of community/government partnerships [and] have the respect and 'buy-in' of all partners" (12). In many cases, the only people with an intimate understanding of community/government collaboration are those involved in government. Perhaps the criteria allows for a government representative to be appointed by default?

In sum, government documents provide a template for communities to engage in marketization, and the responsibilization of their own well-being in order to overcome the loss that has defined Newfoundland society. To what extent do those engaged in development in Goose Brook participate in this discourse? To what extent do they therefore operationalize these techniques? In the next section I situate these texts in the context of Goose Brook, development initiatives, and the participation of local actors.

Goose Brook: Narrative and the Reproduction and Disruption of Neoliberal Techniques

Creative Newfoundland and Labrador (2006) is relevant to Goose Brook's situation because the community has spent the last ten years applying for funding to expand their Boat Building Museum. The Museum's paid staff serve on the Heritage Board which is represented on the community's Hope Committee. The Hope Committee is an arm of council and has approximately 10-12 individuals who represent the municipal council, the Recreation Commission, the Fire Department, the Harbour Authority, and private business. The purpose of the Hope Committee is to unite the community groups so they may work toward the common goal of keeping the community alive. All proposals go through the Hope Committee and they try to make arrangements that will help as many community groups as possible. They serve as a steering committee in the community to ensure projects run smoothly and without difficulty. The Hope Committee works towards making the best of the community and wishes to help stop the decline that has plagued the community.

Goose Brook's Museum, unlike other community's museums, has a mandate to preserve the traditional art of boat building that has been significant to the community's history. Thus, they are engaging with the ideas presented in *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador*. They work with the 'intangible cultural heritage' buzzword and truly believe it is their responsibility to preserve the traditional arts while simultaneously creating a market for them. They are certainly convinced of the message this document conveys. In the late 1990s, the Museum's summer staff of students built a traditional boat in the Museum's boat building room. They did this using the traditional tools and accomplished

it with the help of the community's seniors – the men who once built boats for a living. They launched this boat the traditional way and have been dedicated to the art ever since. The Museum's employees believe they need to pass on this tradition before it is lost. They are concerned that the older generation is dying and if they do not unite them with the youth, their art will die with them. However, while there is evidence that some of the initiatives in these documents are relevant and being embraced by communities, they still need to be reflected on critically. For instance, while people recognize the need for preservation of Newfoundland culture, the passing on from generation to generation has traditionally been done through story telling, singing, and other forms of informal transmission, not through government documents that attempt to engaged people economically (see *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador* 2006).

Critically, we need to ask whether or not people involved in development should be engaging with community and culture on this level. Do people want to market themselves in the way suggested by *Marking Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006*? Are Newfoundlanders comfortable with maintaining stereotypes that Neis (2000) and Overton (1996) argue are partial and dismiss social inequality? Is investment in culture actually going to lead to the developments the document promises?

Unfortunately, even when people are aware of their character, uniqueness, heritage, and environment, and have taken steps to capitalize on it, financial resources are all too often limited, thus leaving people with infrastructure they are unable to maintain. The people of the community I studied, for instance, have secured enough funding to erect certain forms of infrastructure, but there is a limit to the money and this has prevented them from going forward, reaching their short-term goals, and ultimately

leaving them unable to attain their long-term goal of becoming a self-sustaining tourist destination. While these documents illustrate the desires of the government, they provide little information as to how to carry out these projects.

Despite the fact that the people involved in Goose Brook's development are engaging with the discourse presented in the government documents, their narratives will demonstrate that development is not as schematic as the government documents would imply. Those involved with the Museum are in a position requiring them to recognize the government's agenda, but they illustrate that they do not necessarily have to agree with it or carry it out. They understand the importance of partnership, culture, tourism, and funding – among other things – but their work in the community's development demonstrates they do not necessarily believe government initiatives are well suited to, or appropriate for, their particular situation.

In Their Own Words: The Voices of Development

The narratives I explore below suggest neoliberal discourse is both reproduced and contested by social actors who are involved in development initiatives. I spoke with the following participants.

Drew is a woman in her mid-thirties. Although she does not live in Goose Brook, she does reside in a neighbouring community located along the same coast. She, along with her co-worker, Jamie, are the only paid staff involved in Goose Brook's development. As a child, Drew was fascinated with museum work and subsequently went on to study archaeology at the university level. However, in the fourth year of her program, she realized that museum work was her true calling and moved on to complete a diploma in Cultural Resources Management. Since completing her training she has

worked at the Museum in Goose Brook. This position has required her to take on many different roles and carry out many different tasks. She is responsible for coordinating the Service Canada sponsored Youth Project, drafting proposals, applying for future funding, and serving as a member on the community's Heritage Board. Drew is also the Museum Curator.

Jamie is in her early thirties. Like Drew, she does not live in Goose Brook; she commutes to work every day from a neighbouring town. Jamie is university educated with a double major in History and Folklore and has also completed the majority of a Tourism degree. Jamie got her start in development in a different capacity than Drew. She started as a Heritage Coordinator in the Gros Morne National Park area. After completing her contract there, she applied for a position with The Goose Brook Boat Building Museum and had been an employee there for less than a year when these interviews were carried out. However, her experiences with development all across the province were insightful and aided her expression of development in Goose Brook. Like Drew, Jamie's position with the Museum is extensive. She too is involved in preparing proposals, applying for funding, and serving on the Heritage Board.

Ann is the youngest development activist in Goose Brook. At the time of the interview, Ann was only 26 years old. At the age of 20, Ann was a student employee at the Museum, but worked her way up through the ranks and finally became the Assistant Curator. Like Jamie, Ann has a university degree and makes her living as a substitute teacher. She is adamant about staying in Goose Brook and is content to work as a substitute teacher until a full-time position becomes available. Like Drew and Jamie, Ann is a member of the Heritage Board. Unlike Drew and Jamie, however, she is not required

to be there as a condition of her employment and so she works as a volunteer. Besides Drew and Jamie, Ann is the only female on the board[7], and easily the youngest, with other members having been her teachers in school.

One of Ann's former teachers is Louis. Louis, who is in his fifties, has been involved in development for a long time and was formerly a member of the local Regional Economic Development Board[8]. However, Louis expressed discontent with the Zone Board and left his seat there to become more active with development in his own community. Louis volunteers his time and is often responsible for creating proposals, applying for funding, giving presentations, and speaking with government officials. Louis is also a member of the Hope Committee.

Bob is the Mayor of Goose Brook and has been active in development for six years. He has been volunteering his time to the community since he retired. Unlike the other participants, Bob does not have any post-secondary education. He believes that although he does not have a formal education, he has what he calls "street smarts" and it is his view that they can go a long way in what he does. Bob's main calling is not the Museum. Although he helps out whenever he can, he dedicates the majority of his time to the Community RV Park and walking trails. Bob's experience with development also began at the Zone Board. Like Louis, he was not impressed with the efforts carried out by the REDB and left with his own ideas in mind. His ideas flourished into the Hope Committee – an LSP, or local strategic partnership, made up of representatives from other smaller committees in the community. An LSP, "is a body which brings together at

---

[7] Since conducting this research, another young woman has joined the Heritage Board. This woman is 31 years of age and returned to Goose Brook to take over her family's business.

[8] There are REDBs located across the province, one for each economic zone, thus they are often called 'Zone Boards.'

a local level the different parts of the public sector as well as the private, business, community and voluntary sectors so that different initiatives and services support each other and work together" (Geddes 2006:79). Goose Brook's Hope Committee oversees the projects other groups are interested in and serves the purpose of controlling duplicated proposals/projects and aims to take on the projects that would generate the most benefit for the community as a whole. Thus far, the committee has been a success and Bob is proud of the work it has accomplished.

As Mayor of Goose Brook, Bob feels he had a particular accountability to the community because of his elected status. Bob first got involved in his community after he retired:

> Well, when I retired, I worked all my life, and when I retired I had nothing to do, so I decided to become a volunteer. So, I ran for council, got elected, still that didn't fill the void for what I wanted to do. I wanted more to do. So, we had a part of a park in [Goose Brook] at the time and...every council meeting we go to there'd be twenty minutes they decide talking about the park, which was, as far as I was concerned, was a waste of time. And I said to the councillors, I said, 'we'd be talking about the park every meeting,' I said, 'and it's a waste of time. There's nothing being done about it, we're just talking we,' I said, 'got to take action if you're going to do anything.' I said, 'give me permission and I'll take over the park and I'll develop it.' So, the councillors gave me permission. So, I took the park over and I started developing it. So, that's how I got into the rural community thing.[9]

Bob, like the other participants, interprets neoliberal discourse in various ways depending on the context. He reproduces ideas of accountability and partnership, but he does so in a hybrid fashion. For example, there are instances when he sees community as needing to be more responsible, yet there are times when he thinks government must step in and provide help to communities requiring it. For instance, when I asked Bob who he thought should be responsible and accountable for managing risks, he said "the government".

[9] The narratives in this study have been edited for clarity. However, the changes made do not affect the content of what was expressed.

However, he also said communities need to be involved and they need to be responsible for what goes on in their towns, as well as held accountable for the money they receive from government. He said:

> There's people goes in looking for this money and they tries to run a bluff. You can bluff the government for so long, but after a while they're going to catch on to you. When I went looking for something it was very legitimate. I didn't try to bluff anyone, I don't think you should. You're going looking for taxpayer's money. If you get it, spend it wise and get the job done. That's my motto...There has been a lot of federal money wasted...there's been millions of dollars just gone that's been wasted and nothing shown for it. Community next to us has spent millions and millions of dollars...but there's nothing to show for the money they've spent. Nothing. And as far as I'm concerned, that's not the way it should be...I was with the local development association for early years and there was a pile of money coming in and nothing being done. So, I can't, I just can't stay here, I got to do something. And that's when I decided to start the [Hope Committee] and go for my own. And I told them over [there]...I said, 'look, what I'm going to be looking for is [Goose Brook] only,' I said, 'I don't want no involvement with anyone else.'

When I asked him what an important aspect of getting funding was, he went on to state that: "[the government] knows that if the Town of [Goose Brook] gets funding, it's going to be put to good use. They know that from the previous projects, you know?" This indicates Bob thinks his community has been responsible with the funding they have received from government thus far and he thinks that being accountable to government and showing them they are acting wisely will better their chances for future funding. Louis shares this same idea:

> I think there should be accountability in projects that these things take on....The future funding would depend upon how well you used your last, not what political stripe you are or how loud a voice you got. So, if you prove your worth. And I'm sure the funding that we're going to get in the future will be, will certainly, they'll reflect on what we've done in the past.

Louis also believes the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is becoming a little more accountable as well. He says:

> I think with this government now, they seem to be taking more accountability, bringing that more into the picture. [Accountability of themselves] and also accountability of requiring that anybody they fund have a well proven plan before they do it. But see, in a lot of cases, the plan...are not well proved because they don't have the means or the knowledge or the ability to create them. They may have the ideas.

This also demonstrates Louis' belief that government must take a more proactive role in helping communities get their ideas started, or help them locate ideas suitable for their communities. In this sense, Louis contests the withdrawal of government services. He sees value in community responsibility and accountability, but believes there is a more active role for government to occupy. He continues:

> It seems that maybe the government could identify some opportunities that are attainable for the people, which they're not doing now. There's more of a reaction to the people if they [the people] go to them [the government]....I think [accountability] is a role government should play in this rural development. Like I say, they are reactive now, it seems the provincial government is reactive to people that go looking rather than encouraging people to look. They should be more proactive...Why can't some professional people working with the department of development or whatever, suggest, or come and, I'm sure, I mean, it wouldn't take you long to see the kinds of things that need to be done....Government certainly should play a role to help steer people in the direction. Now, if the people take the lead then they should support the people. But in places where there's not much of a lead, they should try to stimulate the people to move forward, and certainly be willing to say 'no' to things that are not going to work.

This is something in which Drew and Jamie also see value. Jamie states:

> There's no plan really for rural development in this province. And that was something else we were talking about at AHI [Association for Heritage Industries]. Right now, we have the Cultural Plan written which we lobbied for for years before it was actually, and now one of the things that is now, we would lobby, but we would like, you know, support that could be a rural plan, a rural development plan and that culture and heritage'd play a part in it...and the fact that [the] province, like within rural development there is no plan. So, when something goes drastically wrong in the community there's nothing there for them to resource, to help them right? Because not every community is lucky to have all the resources that other communities have.

This illustrates how even paid workers in the community see the need for more support for volunteers. All of the participants express discontent with the amount of responsibility being offloaded onto volunteers. In neoliberal discourse, not only are economic responsibilities offloaded onto the community, but social responsibilities are as well. While discussing funding the community is currently seeking, Drew stated: "Well, I mean that is just on the volunteer's back, you know? I mean they all have real lives outside of this...you know? And I mean, they're a great group, it's not at all, you know, that way, but I mean, that's the facts of it." Jamie continued:

> And you know, a lot of this what is going on, there's so much being downloaded on the volunteers that they really can't take on anymore, and it's really hard. I guess not even the government, but even just other people to understand that you got to have staff in order for stuff to move ahead and in some cases, myself and [Drew] are flat out most days, and there's stuff that should be getting done that we just can't do either....I think that the government, the provincial government, needs to realize that if they were putting money into staffing planners, staffing this type of work, you know, on a regional basis, but not just a huge regional, but I mean, if you got a couple of communities working together, if you got three or four communities working together, then you could have a planner for that region. If the money is coming from the province and there's something actually getting done out there in the community, that's better than all the make-work projects in the world because then things grow. And that's how things happen. But you can't put it all on volunteers because volunteers cannot do it. You can't, you just can't.

Ann added:

> They don't realize that you may have three different, four different committees and it's the same four people on these four committees. There's just not enough man power....There's just not enough hours in the day to get everything done. I had to stop doing some of the things I was doing because I just, I couldn't do it, and I'm lucky I learned that at a young age because if I didn't you'd just have no time for yourself.

Bob is a prime example of what Ann is referring to. He states:

> I don't sit home in the mornings, I'm out on the job. I'm on the job lunchtime, I'm on the job in the evenings, I'm there until the job is finished. It's dedication, and a lot of it. I'm, she [his wife] didn't, when I was out on those projects, she didn't see me, only for lunch and for supper and be gone to a meeting after

> that...sometimes twelve hours a day, that's what I put in as a volunteer, seven days a week...all volunteer.

These excerpts demonstrate how valuable volunteers are to the community and the importance my participants place on their work. Yet, at the same time, they dispute the amount of responsibility that is offloaded onto them. While Bob, Louis, and Ann are good examples of the level of dedication possessed by the volunteers in Goose Brook, the participants feel that not all people who could be involved are involved and there are some still who do not appreciate the work being done on their behalf. Louis said, "local people have to take some lot of control, but in some cases there's only so many things you can do." He also stated:

> The danger in small communities, let's get to that, the danger is that you don't have many people now that are able to carry the ball. Because you can say what you like, you can avoid it if you like, there's brain-drain, and some of your better people are going. And it's not, we're not talking about you know, I don't mean to degrade anybody by saying they can't do certain things...but they can't, they can't.

Bob stated: "[the] people in the community's not getting involved. People in the community got to get involved. You get a lot more done." He continued:

> And there's still some of them that will not agree that what's done is a good thing. I mean to say, there's a Park there now that's worth I say about two and a half million dollars. That's a big asset to a small town. But people can't see what's on each side of them, all they can see is what's straight ahead. They don't think it is a good thing.

Jamie and Drew also believe that because the volunteers who are now active do such a great job, others do not think they would play a significant enough role in the community's development if they were to volunteer. Drew states:

> Well, I think here, I don't know if this is everywhere, but I think what happens here is you got individuals that are so strong, and so able, and so vibrant, that everybody else says, 'sure, I don't have to do nothing because [Bob] is going to

> do that, Melvin's [another volunteer] going to do that sure, so what am I going to do? I can't compete.'

Jamie added:

> I found the same thing in Woody Point 'cause there were certain people that were, on the various boards and stuff and, 'oh, well, we know that they're involved in that, so that's going to get done'....But there's certain people that always, they know that if this person's involved it's going to get done.

However, while they think there are people who feel this way, they also express discontent with others who do not see the value in what they are doing and, in fact, try to make things even more difficult for them. Jamie continued:

> You can't escape it [small town politics] at all, you just kind of work with it, and try to, do your best. And there's always people in the community, no matter what you're trying to do, you got one group that's always going to say, 'oh, it's not going to work.' But then you got other people that when they see stuff starting to work, they're like, 'that's really good. Now we kind of understand what you're trying to do.'

When asked if anyone in the community was excluded, Drew said:

> There's an individual who comes through and she makes it difficult for me on a regular basis. But she's not excluded, she excludes herself because she tries desperately to...I think some people just want to make things hard for other individuals, and she's good at that...And it's the same in every community, there's got to be people to make a stir, and that's the way it is.

These comments illustrate that the notion of community, as it is presented in neoliberal discourse, as well as the construction of community in the Newfoundland literature, is not at all indicative of how community plays out on the ground. All participants do feel there is some sense of community in Goose Brook, but the extent of it certainly does not reflect the ideas presented in the rural idyll. Moreover, there are instances, as illustrated by Ann, that suggest not only are there people who do not want to volunteer, but there are people who do want to volunteer but do not feel welcomed. Ann tells of her experience:

> Community politics is a very interesting thing, and especially when you have the stark traditional and somebody who has been away, and educated in a different way, in a different time, and then all of a sudden they come back and they're like, 'oh, you know, we organized this in a different way, or we can use technology to do this, or you're looking at this totally wrong.'...In my opinion, on some of them committees, those are the four people that have been there for the last twenty years and they run it the same way now as they ran it the first year they were there. And they're opinionated, they felt they built it from the ground up, and so they have, a lot of them have been there since day one and built it from the ground up, but when you reach your peak, it's time to step down and let somebody else go. And, I think a lot of the times, like I've said before, that has something to do with it...not that they don't think you're able, it's just that they know they're able...and, 'this is the way it always works so why can't it work now?' People don't want to go in and fight like that. And it's discouraging when you try to push yourself onto people who know what they're doing....It's intimidating to go in and walk in somewhere and say, 'OK, I'll help, where are the spoons?' 'What do you mean?' 'Well, we're going to set the tables, I'm here to volunteer, I'm here to help...' 'They're over there in the drawer, what are you asking?' 'OK, that's alright.' And then, they've been around each other for song long, it's intimidating to go in and walk into this because they all know where they're going.

While the participants continue to contest various notions of neoliberal policy and view others as hybrids, there are some techniques they reinforce and reproduce. Partnership, community, and risk are notions the participants worked with and discussed during our interviews. Partnership was one concept we discussed because of Goose Brook's Hope Committee. This committee is an LSP established by Bob in order to ensure things in the community did not happen in isolation of one another. As Louis explains:

> The purpose of the [Hope Committee] is to draw together the different groups and to be a focus of, like a steering committee for the town so that there's not everybody going their own which way, that there's a focus as to what we want to do and the decision is made there what approach you're going to take. So things aren't happening disjointly, they're happing for a reason.

This is indicative of Goose Brook's reproduction of neoliberal techniques on a community level. Moreover, they recognize that government wants to see this carried out by them and they understand it will be beneficial to them if they take part. Bob explains:

"I was told by ACOA and by Service Canada, you got a 90% better chance to get a project if you got all the committees working together and this is what we're doing with the [Hope Committee]." Louis also made a remark similar to this: "I remember what ACOA said. We presented [the Linking Report] to ACOA, a group of us went in, which I think every community should try to do, you know, tie everything together, and they said, 'finally, a breath of fresh air'." Furthermore, when asked if the community has partnered with government, Louis says, "[oh] yes, definitely, I mean, that's how these things got here." Although, Bob says, "the ones [communities] that can survive should be left alone and let them, and once they get established they should be left alone and let them do it on their own...if they're self-sufficient they don't need it [government involvement]." However, Bob also believes federal and provincial government partnering is needed to aid in the development of his community. While participants did see the value of government involvement in terms of providing support and direction, and in working together through partnerships, they also maintained that accountability must be had by the community's citizens. This reinforces a neoliberal tendency to unload responsibility onto the community. When discussing the dangers in rural communities, Louis said:

> I think that's the biggest problem in rural areas and it's becoming worse, the fact that you're losing the best of your people and we're educating people and sending them out. And you've got a lot of soldiers here that do the down-in-the-trenches work, but you got no commanders telling or organizing to have something for them to do. And that's sad. So, with rural Newfoundland, I mean, the people got to be thinking, but I think we went through a long period of time where people weren't thinking. They were saying, 'what can you do for me?' rather than, 'what I can do for myself'....You know, local people have to take some lot of control, but in some cases, there's only so many things you can do.

Furthermore, when asked what was missing from rural development, Louis said: "[well], certainly grassroot initiative is missing." These comments indicate that he sees value in

people taking initiative and working to better themselves rather than relying on government to do everything for them. However, the comments Louis provided earlier show that he does not necessarily reproduce neoliberal policies exactly how government expects. He obviously sees value in community participation, but he also expresses a need for government to provide direction for those communities that have difficulty participating. While those involved show that they often contest the nature of community, they still do appreciate the value of community involvement in development.

Active citizenship is a neoliberal technique used to responsibilize people and make them more accountable to their communities. The participants expressed a need for community involvement, but it was a hybrid community involvement that did not necessarily reflect the views of government. They all believe there is a more active role to be had by government. For instance, when discussing accountability and risk management in Goose Brook, Jamie stated:

> But all this isn't coming from the government down, it's coming from the community up. And that's what has to happen a lot more and in some cases it's not that people don't want to do, they don't know how to do it in rural Newfoundland because there is no support system for them. There's very little support, there's very little professional people, as such...But it has to come from the community and somebody within the community has to take the leadership to do it...because you know, look at all the government programs come top down, there's no leeway, they have no idea about how things work, especially in rural areas...but not only that, government programs are so blank that they don't really address the issues of regional individuality.

Bob viewed his responsibility to his community as far-reaching and indiscriminate. He explains:

> I'm not interested in the Museum. They want some money come to me and I'll make out a proposal and get it for them. But that's all the dealings I want with it. You know, I'm not a museum guy. But I'll help them any way I can because it's for the community right? And they call on me lots of times for help and when they call I always goes and helps them.

This excerpt demonstrates Bob's reproduction of the idea of community presented by neoliberal governments. Bob obviously engages with 'community' very seriously and thinks that regardless of his interests, he needs to do what has to be done in order to benefit Goose Brook as a whole.

All of the neoliberal concepts that have been discussed thus far have proven to be much more complicated when viewed on the ground. Certainly, they are often contested and are frequently combined with other discourses, depending on the context of the narrative. It is clear that neoliberalism does not work monolithically, and in fact is not a totalizing concept. The way it is interpreted varies from person to person, and also from context to context. This is in sharp contrast to the way governmentality studies often portray neoliberalism. Jamie and Drew's opinions on volunteer burn-out are empathetic for those who are actually volunteers. They are the only paid staff, yet they value the incalculable time and energy exerted by the community's dedicated volunteers. They understand because, although they are paid, many responsibilities are offloaded onto them as well. Jamie explains:

> Well, I don't think either one of us actually thought that we'd ever end up in development. When we started doing this, when you work in heritage in Newfoundland, you actually are developing a whole industry when you start, you're responsible for a lot of getting projects and employment opportunities and things like that, stuff that you don't, normally, if you were working in a bigger museum... that you're not generally responsible for any of this kind of stuff. Because you're the person that's paid, you have to become very adaptable and I don't think anybody in heritage ever thinks that they're a developer as such, but they are. I don't think of myself as working in community economic development, and it was only until somebody said to me, 'you know, you're really a type of development officer,' that I really realized what I was doing. I'm working in heritage and doing heritage projects, but no, you're a little bit of everything, especially in rural Newfoundland.

Drew continues:

> And, I think too, we often find ways to create employment for ourselves after [our current contracts expire] because so often we run on a project by project basis and so as one project is fully established, we're already started to think about, 'OK, when this is done, how are we going to get funding for next month or next year or two years time or whatever it is.' So, a lot of our work involves recreating that thing, and not just for ourselves, but for others, you know?

Since they are expected to take on many roles, they appreciate the dedication of volunteers. Indeed, they believe a lot of what has gotten done in the community has been because of volunteers like Bob. While discussing Bob's role in the community, Drew said,

> I was here one day last year in this office and [Bob] was out there and I could hear him, right? And, 'cause he was getting a bit hot under the collar, and I walked out and he said something and I said, 'what are you at, [Bob]?' He said, 'I don't know,' he said, 'but I'm calling them.' He was waiting on a phone call from the Prime Minister. He wasn't going no less than that. 'No,' he said, 'now I'll take it you know, from his secretary or whatever,' but he wasn't going below him. 'No, no, I'm not going fooling around with all them ranks and get passed from one to another.' And you know what? They called him back.

This replicates Larner and Craig's (2005) notion of the professionalization of volunteers. They found that in New Zealand, "advocates of local partnerships are very often community activists who have been forced into, opted for, or been recruited into new "professionalized roles" (p. 405). All of the efforts made by the paid staff and volunteers in Goose Brook are done so the community can avoid risks that lead to loss of services, out-migration, and/or resettlement. They understand there are risks and they engaged with the idea of risk during our discussions.

The notion of risk was discussed with each participant, but Louis and the women from the Museum engaged with it most thoroughly. They each approached risk and worked with it in the same manner as Merry (2001). Louis, Drew, and Jamie each discussed a government program that targets at-risk youth. They did not necessarily

contest it; they did not agree with the unloading of this responsibility onto the community, but they understood that using this program was one of the only ways the Museum could have a paid summer staff. Drew said:

> It's geared, the Youth Project itself is, this is their words not mine, it's targeted at 'challenged youth', OK? And they have challenges in one way or another, 'at-risk youth' they'll call them. And that can be everything from a physical disability, to trouble with the law, learning disabilities, having a child while they were still in high school, didn't complete high school, or just simply not able to find successful employment...The idea is that this project then will give them some employability skills, it might, then give them an area where they want – that's a cute word isn't it? 'Employability Skills? – give them something that they're interested in...or it could entice them to go back to school. So, at the end of the day, in the real world, what happens is these young people, when they walk away from this project, they've completed the project, and basically that means they just have to show up every day, they'll have enough hours to qualify for EI [Employment Insurance] and then, if they want to go back to school, to post-secondary school, they can get it funded, and that is a real draw card for most of these young people.

Louis elaborates:

> It's, it all depends a lot on the quality of the people you get because what you're dealing with are students, young people at-risk, so there's something wrong in that they're not moving forward. So you got to take these people and try to solve their problem as well as solve your problem. It doesn't always work...There's something where they haven't achieved their potential. Now, it's good in name, to take people, and we've been fairly successful in this, students that we've had in a lot of them have gone on and done something, but if you get the wrong individuals, I mean, you got individuals there that probably need psychiatric help, if you get the wrong individuals, you can't help them. It's like, [Drew] is not a psychologist, she's not a social worker...but they're thrown out to you, 'do what you can with them,'...but if you don't take that on, then you don't have, we wouldn't have had the Museum opened for very much this summer other than that...The intent is good, but the support mechanisms, and [Drew] could probably speak to that more than I could, the support mechanisms to help support the people that are involved are, I don't think, are there.

The excerpts taken from participant interviews clearly indicate they are working within neoliberal discourse as prescribed to them by government. However, it is clear that government has not succeeded in limiting what the people of Goose Brook are able

accomplish. By interpreting neoliberalism the way they do – by contesting and reproducing it differently depending on the context – the participants are able to adjust the terms to better suit their own development agenda. This is clear in the way Drew and Jamie go about writing proposals for funding. When discussing a project they are currently applying for, Jamie stated:

> We're still developing a lot of how we're going to go about this and Museum stuff, if we're successful in getting this project it can help us spread out more within the project, but also develop how we're going to do this...we're kind of not going to tell the [government] people of some of the things that we're going to be doing with this project because they're looking for certain things. But we know that once we got this we can do this...and I mean, you do that in every project...especially if you're working in heritage because there's very little thing that you can actually say. You can't take a heritage project and it'll fit perfectly into government project, there's no way. So, you work your project to fit the government program. And you do it with everything.

This notion of changing things to fit certain programs is necessary when one considers the discontent that rural people experience with government and its programs. Jamie elaborates:

> There's been so much stuff tried in Newfoundland that hasn't worked because there was not understand of how things worked in communities and stuff a lot of people are pretty jaded about stuff...and know, there's people that you go to meetings and they'll talk about something and I've heard lots of times, 'oh, sure, we did this a couple years ago, we did total same thing and nothing ever came out of it, and we're here again telling them the same thing and still nothing came out of it.' I think in some cases too, it's that you bang your head against the wall so often that you just give up in some cases.

While talking about wasted government money, she continues:

> But a lot of that comes from the fact that there's a lot of cases, the people who are viewing the projects don't even really understand what makes this project good or what doesn't make this project good in regards to, well to heritage because a lot of them don't have any experience at all with heritage and they just sit down and they look at this and they look at the budget.

People involved in development are often forced to write their proposals in order to suit government templates for development. While their proposals may indicate one way they will go about using the government funding, they often spend it on other initiatives as well. They use the money as they say they are going to, but they also put it towards other projects that were not part of their initial application. They do this so they can get the most out of the funding. Furthermore, they are aware that they must be engaged with certain buzzwords in order to convince government that they are consuming the discourse. When asked if he thought there were specific things government was looking for in a proposal, Louis said, "[probably] so much of that. The right buzzwords. We know now that 'intangible cultural heritage' is [what they want to hear]. Now, it happens that we're involved with it, but you certainly make sure you tell people you're involved with it."

By engaging in narrative interviews, I was able to locate the extent to which neoliberal policy documents influence the way rural people go about developing their communities. The participants in my study certainly contested a great amount of the techniques government is using, yet at the same time found ways to work with it and often times reproduced it. By viewing neoliberalism as a changing discourse and interpreting it in various ways, the people of Goose Brook have been able to work within, and often step outside the boundaries that have been placed on them by government.

V.
DISCUSSION

The critical discourse analysis of federal and provincial government documents illustrates that neoliberal discourse permeates governance in both Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador. In particular, these texts advance the techniques of governance that permits governance from afar. Moreover, they engage with the specific techniques which have been laid out in the governance literature. For instance, partnership, responsibilization and accountability, active citizenship, and competition in a global market economy are all techniques and goals of neoliberal governance that are visible in the government documents.

For example, *Collaborating with Community* (2003) illustrates how the provincial government has been involved in collaboration with many different groups in order to influence and/or debate policy development. On a federal level, ACOA promotes partnerships among all stakeholders. Responsibilization and accountability can be found throughout the government publications as well, and are often articulated with ideas of active citizenship.

It is quite evident that government is using and promoting techniques of neoliberal governance, particularly an articulation with community. Rural areas are increasingly dependant on individual and community responsibility and accountability to compensate for the withdrawal of state assistance (Cloke, Milbourne, and Widdowfield 2000; Jones and Little 2000; MacKinnon 2002; Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004). Governing through community involves creating spaces where people are governed by values and morals such that they are compelled to benefit their communities (Rose 1999: 172). Volunteers are now expected to actively seek funding for development projects;

other projects see community members taking on at-risk youth to equip them with 'employability skills'; and still other initiatives pull at the heartstrings of 'who we are' and 'what we do' in order to engage as many people as possible. To what extent have historical notions of 'community' been harnessed by this neoliberal regime?

'Community' has historically been a social site in rural Newfoundland. Systems of reciprocity, informal give and take; as well as friends, neighbours, and kin being available to help whenever aid was needed are, and have been, an actualization in Newfoundland communities, particularly the rural outports. Newfoundlanders pride themselves on being from that province and feel a great attachment to it, and not simply the place, however, but the characteristics associated with it and its people. The government is quite aware of this affection and articulate their neoliberal techniques with community. Evidence of the government's knowledge of the attachment Newfoundlanders have for their province is found in *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador* (2006). In one instance the document states: "[our] people take great pride in the cultural identity that binds us as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. It enhances our lives socially and economically, inspiring us to maintain our unique culture for the future" (p. 17).

In many of the documents analyzed, government played on this attachment to place in order to advance neoliberal discourse. In *Marketing Activities and Partnership Opportunities* 2006, Tom Hedderson, the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation states: "[creativity] defines who we are, what we do, and how we live. Creativity is relevant to our target markets" (p. 2). Similarly, *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador* states that "[a] strong cultural sector gives shape and voice to our values and views,

contributing vitally to our identity as a people and province" (p. 11). By identifying the need to pass on Newfoundland heritage over and over in such a way, one can conclude that it is a technique used by government to engage people who feel a sense of place and community and it is a technique that passes responsibility and accountability on to the people of the province. When people do engage in cultural investment and development, they are being governed at a distance by government-created guides and best practices. Atkinson (1999) asserts: "central government determines the 'rules of the game' that localities must accept" (p. 63). Critically, *Marketing Activities and Partnership Opportunities* is too immersed in convincing Newfoundland's people of their unique culture to really allow those people to take advantage of the opportunities presented in it. Many rural areas are in fact turning to tourism, but lack of resources often hinders their success. Rather than spending so much time convincing the people of something they are already aware of, the document should have provided lists of funding sources, for instance. Furthermore, rather than presenting a list of forums, conferences, and other opportunities for marketing, the government should have first directed a chapter towards people who are interested, but not yet able to work in the tourism sector.

At the same time, social actors are actively constructing ideas of community and articulating them with government ideas, as well as changes in governing. Goose Brook is clearly engaging with the neoliberal discourse federal and provincial governments present to them. For the most part, the participants are aware of the importance placed on partnership, accountability and responsibilization, active citizenship, and risk management. However, not only did they indicate their awareness of these techniques, they often felt they were important for their own economic advancement. The Hope

Committee is a deliberate attempt at partnership. While this group was created to avoid duplication of projects in the community, members are aware of its importance when trying to secure government funding. Moreover, they indicate that partnerships such as theirs are applauded by funding agencies such as ACOA and they are now using it to their advantage. Obviously, when it comes to working together within the community, the existing committees within the community are willing to partner for the benefit of the town as a whole. Similarly, they recognize the importance of engaging with government buzzwords when applying for funding. While putting a name to a certain project does not change the nature of the project, using names that engage with government-created buzzwords (i.e., "intangible cultural heritage", see *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador 2006*) indicates to funding agencies that the community is aware of the discourse government is promoting.

The participants in this particular community also reference the importance of being able to engage in the global economy. Their aim is to be self-sufficient in the long-term, but for now they depend upon government funding until they are able to stand on their own. They were engaged in several initiatives in the Fall and Winter of 2006 which, if approved, would allow the community to expand their focus. Most of the projects taken up in this community are tourism based. They want to attract foreign visitors and they are even attempting to draw the attention of virtual visitors through the internet. How they get the attention of foreign visitors, however, is up for debate among the participants. Bob had very different ideas than the other participants. He saw the value in the other participants' projects, and says he will help just to benefit his community, but his heart lies in his own project – the community's RV Park and walking trails. However, the other

participants do not think these attractions are not enough to entice visitors to come and they believe they must expand their assets to bring in more visitors, and thus more revenue.

At first glance it appears as though Goose Brook's activists are over concerned with developing the tourism base. It is no surprise that tourism cannot be the mainstay of a community. The prime time for tourism in Newfoundland is May to October; after that, most tourist businesses close for the winter months. Even in popular destinations such as Gros Morne National Park, there is a limited tourist season. What else, then, can Goose Brook do to secure its future? Goose Brook does place a lot of emphasis on their Museum and RV Park; however, they understand there are other avenues for development. They have tried to secure funding for a breakwater, which would provide them with a safe harbour. The construction of such infrastructure would be beneficial to the Museum (they would like to have floating exhibits), the walking trails (there would be a trail leading to the water), and would allow for further tourism development. If they had a breakwater, they would construct a marina with the same comforts as the RV Park (water, laundry, showers, etc.) which would provide ample incentive for people yachting around the coast of Newfoundland to visit their area. Furthermore, the existence of a safe harbour would allow large vessels to bring in their catch. Goose Brook has a large amount of freezer capacity, but no safe harbour through which ships can enter. Should a breakwater come to Goose Brook they would be able to provide 25 to 30 more jobs at the local fish plant. These jobs, however, were the death of the Fall 2006 proposal Goose Brook submitted to ACOA.

On the day of my interview with Bob, Peter McKay, Minister for ACOA, was in Goose Brook to make an announcement regarding the proposal for a breakwater. Upon his return to Goose Brook, Bob was disappointed to learn their proposal had been rejected. Minister McKay indicated that it is not in ACOA's mandate to fund fisheries projects. He suggested they apply to Canadian Heritage and go through the Museum instead. Consequently, while the community did demonstrate partnership, responsibility and accountability, among other neoliberal strategies, they were not successful in receiving any funding that would be put towards their traditional resource-based industry. Thus, it appears Goose Brook has been forced to put all of their eggs in one basket – tourism and heritage seems to be the only way they can go.

The community has also taken up active citizenship, responsibilization and accountability. These are all apparent in the government documents and the community is engaging with them on a similar level. The participants in this study indicate they think it is their responsibility to develop their community and they believe that if they secure government funding to do so, they should be accountable for what happens with that money. For instance, they believe future funding should depend on the outcome of previous projects funded by government money. All of the participants believe government and community share accountability and responsibility which indicates, however, that they somewhat contest all of the offloading onto communities and volunteers that has occurred.

For instance, Bob believes he is accountable to his community because of his position as Mayor, but community and government share in accountability. Louis thought communities should be responsible for themselves, but government should play a role in

providing direction. Drew thought accountability and responsibility rested in the hands of Bob, but government needed to play a support role. All participants want government programs to be better suited to rural communities, but they recognize the important role volunteers and active citizens play in carrying out development projects. However, a common concern among the participants is the lack of participation. This could be, however, due in part to the declining population of the community. Furthermore, the population of this community is mature, with over 50% of the population being over 45 (Statistics Canada 2002). Moreover, as Louis noted, the population is not well educated. In fact, a full 57% of the population is without a high school certificate (Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency 2001).

A significant finding was that the participants did not directly engage with the idea of community. I asked all of the participants about a sense of community, and they all just said 'yes, there's a sense of community' and then returned to describing their projects or what we had been talking about prior to the question of community. In other contexts of the narrative they did mention 'turf wars' among neighbouring communities and how it negatively impacts the ability for regional cooperation. They also mention small town politics and individuals who do not want to be involved and therefore try to make things difficult. These comments contest the construction of community found in the rural idyll and Newfoundland literature. Participants also only briefly discussed the notion of exclusion. Bob is the only participant who believes certain individuals should be excluded from participating in community development. The other participants believe that anyone in the community is welcomed to participate and they are always putting the call out, but individuals often exclude themselves. While no one directly mentions

community or a sense of community other than to say it exists, there are some signs that things are not as pleasant as the romanticized version of rural Newfoundland would have us believe.

One of the special aspects of neoliberal discourse is its ability to turn seemingly social issues into economic ventures. As *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador 2006* indicates, anything can be made into an economy – from a culture, to the 'brand' of a province. As two of the participants of this study indicate, social services are now also being withdrawn by the state and placed on community developers. The Youth Project – which sustains the biggest tourist attraction in Goose Brook – is a project offered by Service Canada to place at-risk youth in positions that will provide them with 'employability skills'. This is evidence of Merry's (2001) notion of 'risk-based techniques' which divides a population based on risk. As Louis pointed out, there are no support mechanisms in place to help volunteers (or paid staff) who are expected to carry out services that were once provided by government professionals.

Undoubtedly, social actors are very important in reproducing neoliberal discourses. As is evident in the narrative interviews, participants are taking up, interpreting, and implementing neoliberalism in their own work. The participants in this particular study are aware of government expectations and work within the discourse – using buzzwords, engaging in partnership – in order to be successful when seeking government funding. Furthermore, their belief that all communities should be held accountable for how they spend government funding suggests their interpretations of neoliberal discourse often reproduce and reinforce it.

When taking other standpoints in their narratives, participants articulate that they are not at all impressed with government policies on funding. The lack of support and the disconnect they believe exists between government departments and agencies has made it difficult for them to apply for different types of funding. Moreover, they believe it is difficult to put all of the responsibility on community volunteers who are scarce and thus burn-out at a quicker rate. As Larner and Craig (2005) suggest, volunteers are often forced into professionalized roles. Participants also believe that government programs are all too often designed by people who do not work on the ground, resulting in projects that are hard to apply for and/or carry out. To overcome such a challenge, proposals are often written to suit particular funding projects and/or exclude certain aspects of the initiative so funding can be secured. This indicates, in some instances, the participants are also contesting neoliberal policy. They interpret policy to often be difficult to work with, and thus they are forced to make omissions in proposals or suit their projects to certain templates in order to secure the funding they need in order to develop. What they do afterwards does not matter; they simply report what was in the proposal.

The neoliberal discourse present in the Government of Canada and Government of Newfoundland and Labrador documents influences how communities go about development. Community members are engaging with discourses and working with government policies that are often difficult to coordinate. However, they recognize the importance of developing their communities and thus they continue to fight the battle. Participants believe that if their community fails to develop – which they say is not an option for them – they will lose basic services (such as water, sewer, and postal), and ultimately become a ghost town. Therefore, they continue to apply for funding whenever

and wherever the can, they overwork their volunteers, and they do what they think government expects so their community becomes an attractive candidate for government funding.

While the participants may not be aware of the formal elements of neoliberal discourse, they work with it nonetheless. Their awareness of government's promotion of partnership, their want of accountability and responsibility, and active citizenship, as well as their own desire to become competitive in a global market, all indicate that the development workers of Goose Brook are responsive to what is being presented to them as 'normal' behaviour for developing communities. Their narratives also speak to broader social politics. Except for Bob, the participants in this study were concerned with the level of education among rural residents and were fearful of what may happen to small communities if the educated youth continue to leave. While this is another topic all together, it is important to recognize the many dimensions of what 'development' means to small communities. Not only do rural areas wish to see their economies flourish, but they believe it must flourish in order to maintain the social services that exist, to encourage youth in-migration, and to allow their communities a fighting chance for survival.

Neoliberal discourse is obviously setting the terms within which Goose Brook is expected to operate. However, by interpreting it with an open mind and allowing themselves the opportunity to work flexibly with it, the people of the community are re-arranging the terms to best suit their own needs. While they show discontent with how some government programs function, they have certainly been able to make the best of things. While this community has received millions of government dollars over the past

six years, the community is still in decline. Since 2001, the community's population has decreased 7.5% (Statistics Canada 2007) and the participants are evermore aware of the importance of their development if they are to reverse this trend and rebuild what was once a flourishing Newfoundland fishing village.

VI.
CONCLUSION

This thesis examined the extent to which neoliberal techniques inform government documents and how they are interpreted by individuals who participate in rural development. Governmentality provides an effective analytic for approaching the way neoliberal techniques pervade to achieve governance at a distance. A shift to the ethnographic, however, provides an opening for a more interpretive and micro-centred analysis. I argue, by way of conclusion, this thrust could enhance the way we apprehend the operations of neoliberalism. I summarize the features of governmentality that are at play in my study and that can build upon the ethnographic method. In particular, I want to flag a few areas in governmentality studies that are supported by this research and which suggest, as more recent scholars have done, that governmentality analysis should approach neoliberal governance as a flexible, heterogeneous process (see Larner 2000). In particular, let me draw attention to the ideas of partnership and community.

Partnership often brings together state representatives with individuals and community members in order to provide them with a sense of incorporation into policy development and debate. Government is also encouraging forms of partnership that link different groups within one community. Partnership is used by neoliberal governments to govern from afar and is often considered a basic component of neoliberalism (Jones and Little 2000).

While it is believed that active citizenship will be the outcome of rural integration and partnerships (Kearns 1995; Storey 1999; Shortall and Shucksmith 2001), Stoker (1998) suggests there will remain one group in a leading role that is often comprised of those who have been long time members of previously existing community groups, or it

is a leading group that has been implemented by governmental departments (MacKinnon 2000). Similarly, as Herbert (2005) states: "if only a few residents [are] able and willing to be active, then they might well fail to represent the neighbourhood as a whole" (p. 857). Similarly, in many cases, only local elites become involved, resulting in the exclusion of the lower classes of the community (Goodwin 1998: 10). By creating the sense that people are equal partners, government is grouping them with state representatives who formerly held total accountability and responsibility for addressing and dealing with risks. Atkinson (1999) is critical of partnerships and suggests these arrangements promote an invisible 'we/they' dichotomy by forming partnerships and articulating their existence and parameters without consulting with community representatives. The 'we', meaning government, exists before the community is involved. Consequently, "the community then has to enter into an organisational and discursive context which it has played little or no part in creating" (p. 66).

Larner and Craig (2005) approach partnership in much the same fashion as the participants from Goose Brook. They believe development activists serve the function of representing their communities through their ability to "facilitate, mediate and negotiate, nurture networks, and deploy cultural knowledge and local knowledge in ways that enable traditionally 'silent' voices to be heard along with the articulate, persistent, and powerful" (p. 418). This represents a hybrid approach to partnership which rejects the notion that neoliberalism is a monolithic structure that does not allow for interpretation by social agents.

Partnerships, according to Sheldrick (2002), are created by governments who wish to appear as less active while in fact remaining key players in policy formation. He

suggests that combining different sectors will allow for an objective consensus to be reached that is not solely the product of government representatives. He is much more critical than Larner and Craig, however, and believes these partnerships are often made up of an uneven number of government representatives, private sector representatives, public sector representatives, and voluntary sector representatives (Sheldrick 2002: 137-8). Furthermore, he continues, "if consensus does not emerge, and it likely will not, the government retains the right to act on its own" (p. 139). His approach to partnership stresses the rhetorical nature of neoliberal techniques through which government wishes to mask its governing; they appear as less active in governance, but remain in a powerful position through their ability to govern from afar.

The government documents in this study present partnership as an equal opportunity for rural people to engage with government representatives. However, the way in which these partnerships work on the ground is much more indicative of Sheldrick's presumption. In *Collaborating with Community* (2006), for instance, the way in which certain people become excluded points to a less than equal form of partnership. Similarly, ACOA's board members are chosen by a governmental body that has the final say on who will sit. While the Minister can make suggestions, government has the final decision. This is not unlike the Hope Committee in Goose Brook. While all committees in the community are represented on the Hope Committee, the larger group – which is an arm of council – has the final say on which proposals will go through to government funding agencies. In theory, partnership is presented as an equal opportunity method for engaging representatives from all types of backgrounds. On the ground, however, power resides in the hands of government and its representatives.

Another neoliberal technique that becomes questionable when applied on the ground is community. Rose (1999) views community as a technique of governance where self-governing individuals meet state authority. Government appeals to peoples' sense of community in such a way as to influence them to act to better that community. Engaging on a moral level, government makes a plea to individuals' sense of obligation for the place they call home, and in turn requires them to become accountable and responsible for not only themselves and their families, but their entire communities.

The government of Newfoundland and Labrador documents carry out an appeal to community in a way that takes advantage of Newfoundlanders' sense of attachment to the province. Newfoundlanders are, in a sense, very patriotic and show an affection for the physical space in which they live, as well as the feelings that place evokes. In *Marketing Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006* (2006) and *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador* (2006), government appeals to individuals' feelings of 'this place we call home' and 'identity'. By doing so, they engage with people on a larger scale and force them to reminisce about what 'community' means to them. Government does this in order to advance their neoliberal agenda.

The people of Goose Brook do, in some way, believe a sense of community in their town exists, and Bob explicitly said he does some work just to make his town a better place. However, their narratives of exclusion and participation indicate that community is a much more complex notion once it is enacted by workers outside of the government domain. This articulates with Overton's (1996) notion of the 'Real Newfoundland' which conceals and displaces accounts of rural exclusion and social inequality. Indeed, rural Newfoundland is not as idyllic as government discourses imply.

Governments employ a neoliberal mode of governing to offload previously state sponsored services onto the community. Thus, community becomes responsibilized; individual obligation to community has been called upon to take on these duties. By appealing to morals and values, neoliberal governing goes beyond presenting community as a physical space and, instead, situates it as a social phenomenon. The rural idyll is a construction of community that just does not withstand the social forces that exist in a civic setting.

Notions of partnership, community, and the rural idyll are interpreted by subjects. Social agents are individuals with certain social and cultural influences that frame their social experience. Each narrative of rural development provides a personal account of each individual's experience with living and working in a rural community that is attempting to develop. In no way do social actors simply take what they are presented and go along as government directs. Indeed, the development workers of Goose Brook have been successful at creating their own template for development while working with and interpreting neoliberalism as it articulates with their own realities of rural life.

While I have argued that governmentality approaches often depict neoliberalism as a static form of governance, I suggest that these studies should not limit the concept in this way. Indeed, governmentality approaches must change direction towards becoming a form of analysis which approaches neoliberalism as a fluid mode of governing. There is a new form of governance at play in Newfoundland that informs how people understand themselves and the events around them, and in order to adequately examine this, a dynamic, multi-perspectival methodological approach is needed.

In the Newfoundland and Labrador setting it becomes difficult to distinguish between past and present forms of 'community'. One cannot say with certainty that Goose Brook's community collaboration is a form of enacting neoliberal techniques, nor can one assert that it is a continuation of community as it has existed for centuries. Rather, further ethnographic research is needed to map out the path of neoliberal discourse in all its forms as it appears in Newfoundland communities that are engaging in rural development campaigns. Newfoundland's history of 'community' is an interesting yet complex phenomenon that needs adequate ethnographic research in order to inform how governmentality studies approach neoliberalism.

If I were to proceed with an ethnographic investigation of neoliberal discourse and narratives of rural development in Newfoundland, there are a few key points I would certainly include. First of all, I would broaden the scope of investigation. In this study, I conducted narrative interviews with five people involved in Goose Brook's development. Two of those participants were from neighbouring communities and not residents of the town in which they worked. Therefore, I would include more representatives of the community, perhaps including those who are not directly involved in development initiatives, but who see the changes occurring in their community. Furthermore, I would try to elicit more conversation about 'community'. This study posed the question: to what extent does neoliberal discourse inform the conceptualization of 'community'? The history of Newfoundland community suggests that perhaps neoliberalism is not the only factor creating communities that strive for overall well-being. A further ethnographic investigation would address this question more thoroughly.

If I were to undertake a continuation of this study, I would also try to broaden the scope of investigation by doing a comparative analysis of Goose Brook and a community that has not been as successful as Goose Brook. Such an examination would perhaps evoke conclusions this study is unable to make. Narrative interviewing with several people from two different yet similar communities would certainly prove insightful for drawing out generalizations of development in rural Newfoundland. Moreover, it would be useful to track the arrangements of partnerships over time, to map how one committee is interconnected to another and to specific government initiatives, a process I sketched through my discussion of the Hope Committee.

While Newfoundland serves as a site for such an investigation, more international research is required if governmentality studies are to be adequately informed. Perhaps the rural United Kingdom could serve as another site for such studies since its notions of community and the rural idyll parallel those of Newfoundland.

In sum, further ethnographic research is necessary if governmentality studies are to be transformed into multi-perspectival analyses which consider both top-down and bottom-up approaches to development in a neoliberal regime. Certainly, government documents suggest that neoliberal discourse is present in development projects in Newfoundland. However, actors' voices suggest neoliberalism is a construct that can be interpreted in a way which illustrates its heterogeneity.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, Rob. 1999. "Discourses of Partnership and Empowerment in Contemporary British Urban Regeneration." *Urban Studies* 36(1): 59-72.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. 2003. *Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: Five Year Report to Parliament 1998-2003*. Moncton: ACOA.

Bates, Allison C. 1994. "Winterton." Pp. 599-600 in *Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador: Vol. 5*, edited by Cyril F. Poole and Robert H. Cuff. St. John's: Harry Cuff Publications Limited.

Beck, Ulrich. 2000. "The Risk Regime: How the Work Society is Becoming Risk Society." Pp.67-91 in *The Brave New World of Work.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Berry, John, Sir. 197-. *A List of the Planters' Names etc. 1675.* London's Public Records.

Byron, Reginald. 2003. *Retrenchment and Regeneration in Rural Newfoundland.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Chafe, Paul. 2003. "Hey Buddy, Wanna Buy a Culture?." *Culture and State* 3(1): 68-76.

Cheshire, Lynda and Geoffrey Lawrence. 2005. "Neoliberalism, Individualisation and Community: Regional Restructuring in Australia." *Social Identities* 11(5) 435-45.

Cloke, Paul and Paul Milbourne. 1992. "Deprivation and Lifestyles in Rural Wales. – II. Rurality and the Cultural Dimension." *Journal of Rural Studies* 8(4): 359-71.

Cloke, Paul, Paul Milbourne, and Rebekah Widdowfield. 2000. "Partnership and Policy Networks in Rural Local Governance: Homelessness in Tauton." *Public Administration.* 78(1): 111-133.

Davis, Dona. 2000. "Gendered Cultures of Conflict and Discontent: Living 'The Crisis' in a Newfoundland Community." *Women's Studies International Forum* 23(3): 343-53.

Davis, Dona Lee. 2003. "In the Beginning: Region, Crisis, and Occupational Choice Among Newfoundland's Youth." Pp. 177-98 in *Retrenchment and Regeneration in Rural Newfoundland*, edited by Reginald Byron. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dean, Mitchell. 1999a. "Basic Concepts and Themes." Pp. 9-39 in *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

—. 1999b. "Neo-Liberalism and Advanced Liberal Government." Pp. 149-75 in *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* New York: Routledge.

Faris, James C. 1972. *Cat Harbour: A Newfoundland Fishing Settlement.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." Pp. 87-104 in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Geddes, Mike. 2006. "Partnership and the Limits to Local Governance in England: Institutionalist Analysis and Neoliberalism." *International Journal of Urban and Rural Research* 30(1): 76-97.

George, Glynis. 2000. *The Rock Where We Stand: An Ethnography of Women's Activism in Newfoundland.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

—. 2000b. "Violence and Poverty on the 'Rock': Can Feminists Make a Difference?." *Canadian Woman Studies* 20(3): 181-185.

Giddens, Anthony. 1998. "Risk Society: The Context of British Politics." Pp. 23-34 in *Politics of Risk Society* edited by J. Franklin. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goodwin, Mark. 1998. "The Governance of Rural Areas: Some Emerging Research Issues and Agendas." *Journal of Rural Studies* 14(1): 5-12.

Gubrium, Jaber F. and James A. Holstein. 2002. "From the Interview to the Interview Society." Pp. 3-32 in *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method* edited by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Hacking, Ian. 2004. "Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between Discourse in the Abstract and Face-to-Face Interaction." *Economy and Society* 33(3): 277-302.

Herbert, Steve. 2005. "The Trapdoor of Community." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95(4): 850-65.

Herbert-Cheshire, Lynda and Vaughan Higgins. 2004. "From Risky to Responsible: Expert Knowledge and the Governing of Community-Led Rural Development." *Journal of Rural Studies*. 20(3): 289-302.

Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium. 1995. *The Active Interview.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

House, J.D. 2003. "Does Community Really Matter in Newfoundland and Labrador? The Need for Supportive Capacity in the New Regional Economic Development." Pp.

226-267 in *Retrenchment and Regeneration in Rural Newfoundland*, edited by Reginald Byron. Toronto: University of Toronto Press

House, J.D., S.M. White and P. Ripley. 1989. *Going Away...And Coming Back: Economic Life and Migration in Small Canadian Cities*. St. Johns: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Jones, Owain and Jo Little. 2000. "Rural Challenge(s): Partnership and New Rural Governance." *Journal of Rural Studies* 16(2): 171-183.

Kearns, Ade. 1995. "Active Citizenship and Local Governance: Political and Geographical Dimensions." *Political Geography* 14(2): 155-175.

Larner, Wendy. 2000. "Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality." *Studies in Political Economy* 63: 5-25.

Larner, Wendy and Maria Butler. 2005. "Governmentalities of Local Partnerships: The Rise of a 'Partnering State' in New Zealand." *Studies in Political Economy* 75: 79-101.

Larner, Wendy and David Craig. 2005. "After Neoliberalism? Community Activism and Local Partnerships in Aotearoa New Zealand." *Antipode* 37(3): 402-24.

Little, Jo and Patricia Austin. 1996. "Women and the Rural Idyll." *Journal of Rural Studies* 12(2): 101-11.

MacDonald, Martha, Barbara Neis, and Grant Murray. 2007. "State Policy, Livelihood Protection, and Gender on Canada's East Coast (revised version)." Originally presented at: *People and the Sea III: New Directions in Coastal and Maritime Studies Conference*. July 7-9, 2005. Amsterdam, Netherlands. Unpublished manuscript.

Mackinnon, Danny. 2002. "Rural Governance and Local Involvement: Assessing State-Community Relations in Scottish Highlands." *Journal of Rural Studies* 18(3): 207-324.

Mannion, John J. 1976. *Point Lance in Transition: The Transition of a Newfoundland Outport.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.

Merry, Sally Engle. 2001. "Spatial Governmentality and the New Urban Social Order: Controlling Gender Violence Through Law." *American Anthropologist* 103(1): 16-29.

Murdoch, Jonathan and Simone Abram. 1998. "Defining the Limits of Community Governance." *Journal of Rural Studies* 14(1): 41-50.

Neis, Barbara. 2000. "In the Eye of the Storm: Research, Activism and Teaching Within the Newfoundland Fishery Crisis." *Women's Studies International Forum* 23(3): 287-98.

Newfoundland Colonial Secretary's Office. N.d. *Population Returns, 1836.* St. John's: n.p.

–. 1893. *Census of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1891.* St. John's: J.W. Withers.

–. 1923. *Census of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1921.* St. John's: n.p.

Newfoundland and Labrador. 2006. *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador: The Blueprint for Developing and Investing in Culture.* St. John's: Queen's Printer.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador Tourism Marketing Council. 2006. *Marking Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006.* St. John's: Queen's Printer.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency. 2001. *Community Accounts: Winterton, Education Accounts.*. Retrieved from: http://www.communityaccounts.ca/communityaccounts/onlinedata/display_table.asp?whichtabl=table_e11r&comval=com553 on May 13, 2007.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Women's Policy Office. 2004. *Collaborating with Community: Introduction, Rationale, and Guide for Government.* St. John's: Violence Prevention Initiative.

Norcliffe, Glen. 2005. "Local Game, Local Arena: Restructuring in Corner Brook, Newfoundland." St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

O'Malley, Pat. 2002. "Risk Societies and the Government of Crimes." Pp. 17-33 in *Dangerous Offenders: Punishment and Social Order*, edited by J. Pratt and M. Brown. London: Routledge.

Overton, James. 1980. "Promoting "The Real Newfoundland": Culture as a Tourist Commodity." *Studies in Political Economy* 4: 115-137.

–. 1996. "Making a World of Difference: Essays on Tourism, Culture and Development in Newfoundland." St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

–. 2000. "Academic Populists, the Informal Economy and Those Benevolent Merchants: Politics and Income Security Reform in Newfoundland." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 28(1): 1-54.

Phillips, Louise and Marianne Jørgensen. 2002. "Critical Discourse Analysis." Pp. 60-95 in *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Pocius, Gerald L. 1991. *A Place to Belong: Community Order and Everyday Space in Calvert, Newfoundland.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Richling, Barnett. 1985. "'You'd Never Starve Here': Return Migration to Rural Newfoundland." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 22(2): 236-49.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 2002. "Analysis of Personal Narratives." Pp. 695-709 in *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method* edited by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rose, Nikolas. 1996. "The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government." *Economy* 25(3): 327-56.

–. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, Nikolas and Peter Miller. 1992. "Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government." *The British Journal of Sociology* 42(2): 173-205.

Rose, Nikolas, Pat O'Malley, and Mariana Valverde. 2006. "Governmentality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2: 83-104.

Savoie, Donald J. 2003. "Reviewing Canada's Regional Development Efforts." Research paper for *Newfoundland and Labrador Royal Commission on Renewing and Strengthening our Place in Canada.* St. John's: Queen's Printer. Retrieved from: http://www.gov.nl.ca/publicat/royalcomm/research/savoie.pdf on December 7, 2007.

Sheldrick, Byron. 2002. "New Labour and The Third Way: Democracy, Accountability and Social Democratic Politics." *Studies in Political Economy* 67: 133-43.

Shortall, Sally and Mark Shucksmith. 2001. "Rural Development in Practice: Issues Arising in Scotland and Northern Ireland." *Community Development Journal* 36(2): 122-133.

Sider, Gerald M. 1986. *Culture and Class in Anthropology and History: A Newfoundland Illustration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, Peter R. 2002. "Leaving and Staying." Pp. 289-318 in *The Resilient Outport: Ecology, Economy, and Society in Rural Newfoundland* edited by Rosemary E. Ommer. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Statistics Canada. 1982. *Census Divisions and Subdivisions: Population, Occupied Private Dwellings, Private Households, Census Families in Private Households: Selected Characteristics: Newfoundland*. 1981 Census of Canada. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

–. 1987. *Census Canada 1986, Profiles, Newfoundland: Part I*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

–. 2002. *Winterton (table). 2001 Community Profiles*. 2001 Census. Statistics Canada. Ottawa. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.ca/english/profil01/CP01/Details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=1001332&Geo2=PR&Code2=10&Data=Count&SearchText=winterton&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=10&B1=All&Custom= on May 30, 2006.

–. 2007. *Winterton (table). 2006 Community Profiles*. 2006 Census. Statistics Canada. Ottawa. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/data/profiles/community/Details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=1001332&Geo2=PR&Code2=10&Data=Coun

t&SearchText=winterton&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&Custom = on May 13, 2007.

Stoker, Gerry. 1998. "Governance as Theory: Five Propositions." *International Social Science Journal* 50(155): 17-28.

Storey, David. 1999. "Issues of Integration, Participation and Empowerment in Rural Development: The Case of LEADER in the Republic of Ireland." *Journal of Rural Studies* 15(3): 307-315.

Tucker, Otto. 1997. "Winterton – Grave Matters." *Downhomer*, March 1997, pp. 25.

Walters, William. 2001. "Governing Unemployment: Transforming 'the Social'?." Pp. 61-75 in *Rethinking Law, Society, and Governance: Foucault's Bequest*. Edited by G. Wickham and G Pavlich. Portland: Hart Publishing.

APPENDIX A:
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS SELECTED FOR CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. 2003. *Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: Five Year Report to Parliament 1998-2003.* Moncton: ACOA.

–. N.d. *Building a 21st Century Economy, Together: A Guide to the Programs and Services of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.* Moncton: ACOA.

–. N.d. *A Profile of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.* Moncton: ACOA.

Canada, Department of Canadian Heritage. N.d. *Programs and Services for Heritage Organizations in Canada.* Ottawa: n.p.

–. 2005. *Canadian Heritage in Newfoundland and Labrador.* Ottawa: n.p.

Jane Helleur & Associates, Inc.. 2005. *Final Report Evaluation of Facilitating Community Partnerships – Pilot Project Rural Secretariat – Eastern Region.* St. John's: Jane Helleur & Associates Inc.

Newfoundland and Labrador. 2006. *Creative Newfoundland and Labrador: The Blueprint for Developing and Investing in Culture.* St. John's: Queen's Printer.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Strategic Social Plan and the Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency. 2003. *From the Ground Up.* St. John's: Queen's Printer.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Women's Policy Office. 2004. *Collaborating with Community: Introduction, Rationale, and Guide for Government.* St. John's: Violence Prevention Initiative.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador Tourism Marketing Council. 2006. *Marking Activities and Partnership Opportunities 2006.* St. John's: Queen's Printer.

APPENDIX B:
APPLICATION TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH FOR STUDENT RESEARCHERS

REB #_____

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR
APPLICATION TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH FOR STUDENT RESEARCHERS

Please complete, print, and submit the **original plus three (3) copies** of this form to the **Research Ethics Coordinator, Office of Research Services, Chrysler Hall Tower, Room 309**

Date: June 20th, 2006

Title of Research Project: Rebuilding Rural Newfoundland: Advanced Liberalism and the Gendered Interpretations of Rural Development

Projected start date of the project: July 2006 **Projected completion date:** April 200

	Name	Dept./Address	Phone/Ext.	E-mail
Student Investigator[1]	Jennifer Butler	Sociology and Anthropology		butleri@uwindsor.ca
Co-Investigator(s)				
Faculty Supervisor[2]	Dr. Glynis George	Sociology and Anthropology	519-253-3000 ext. 2196	ggeorge@uwindsor.ca

Researchers from another institution who are a part of a research team, irrespective of their role, must seek clarification from their institutional REB as to the requirement for review and clearance. For each researcher, please indicate if REB clearance is required or briefly provide the rationale for why it is not required:

REVIEW FROM ANOTHER INSTITUTION

1. Has this application been submitted to another university REB or a hospital REB? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. Has this application been reviewed, or will this application be reviewed, by another person or a committee for human research ethics in another organization, such as a school board? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES to either 1 or 2 above**,

a. provide the name of the board:

b. provide the date of submission:

c. provide the decision and attach a copy of the approval document: ☐ Approved ☐ Approved Pending ☐ Univ. of Windsor clearance ☐ Other/In Process

[1] STUDENT INVESTIGATOR ASSURANCE

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and correct.

I understand that as Student Investigator, I have responsibility for the conduct of the study, the ethics performance of the project and the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants.

I agree to comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement and all University of Windsor policies and procedures, governing the protection of human subjects in research.

Signature of Student Investigator: _____ Date: _____

[2] FACULTY SUPERVISOR ASSURANCE

Title of Research Project: Rebuilding Rural Newfoundland: Advanced Liberalism and the Gendered Interpretations of Rural Development

Student Investigator: Jennifer L. Butler

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and correct.

I understand that as principal Faculty Supervisor, I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the study, the ethical performance of the project and the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants.

I agree to comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement and all University of Windsor policies and procedures, governing the protection of human subjects in research, including, but not limited to, the following:

- performing the project by qualified and appropriately trained personnel in accordance with REB protocol;
- implementing no changes to the REB approved protocol or consent form/statement without notification to the REB of the proposed changes and their subsequent approval of the REB;
- reporting promptly significant adverse effects to the REB within five (5) working days of occurrence; and
- submitting, at minimum, a progress report annually or in accordance with the terms of certification.

Signature of Faculty Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

A. PROJECT DETAILS

A.1. Level of Project

☐ Ph.D. ☒ Masters ☐ Undergraduate ☐ Post Doctoral

☐ Other (specify):

Is this research project related to a graduate course? ☐ Yes ☒ No
or to your thesis/dissertation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please indicate the course number:

Please explain how this research project is related to your graduate course.

A.2. Funding Status

Is this project currently funded? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **NO**, is funding to be sought? ☐ Yes ☒ No

A.3. Details of Funding (Funded or Applied for)

Agency:

☐ NSERC U of W Grant Account Number:

☐ SSHRC U of W Grant Account Number:

☐ Other (specify):

U of W Grant Account Number:

Period of funding: From: To:

Type of funding:

☐ Grant ☐ Contract ☐ Research Agreement

B. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

B.1. Describe the purpose and background rationale for the proposed project.

The purpose of this project is to examine the impact of neoliberal restructuring on community based initiatives and to assess the responses of local actors in the implementation of these government policies. The research necessitates open-ended, semi-structured qualitative interviews with residents who are involved in community based initiatives associated with these government policies. Rationale: The continuing economic crisis in Newfoundland and Labrador has received much attention from government and academics alike. The fate of rural Newfoundland is unknown, but the implementation of advanced liberal policy in government documents is aimed at improving the current state. However, the literature suggests that there are disparities between how policies are presented and how they are carried out on the ground. The Newfoundland literature suggests that on the ground, the role of women in activist positions is important to rural communities and this may be due to historical gender divisions of labour.

B.2. Describe the hypothesis(es)/research questions to be examined.

This research seeks to examine how people interpret and participate in rural community-based initiatives which are related to government policies. Specifically I seek to uncover what people do in their community-based

participation, how they interpret and understand their roles and that of the policies being introduced. More broadly however I seek to examine the extent to which community-based initiatives and the interpretations of actors are linked to ideas of sustainability, rurality, and identity in Newfoundland. Hence, questions are also directed toward the way men and women construct rural narratives and the extent to which these narratives reflect (a) a response to advanced liberalism and (b) a struggle for a broader politics. The qualitative interviews for which I am seeking ethics review are also supplemented by the analysis of government documents using critical discourse analysis.

B.3. Methodology/Procedures

B.3.a. Do any of the procedures involve invasion of the body (e.g. touching, contact, attachment to instruments, withdrawal of specimens)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B.3.b. Does the study involve the administration of prescribed or proscribed drugs? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B.3.c.i. Specify in a step-by-step outline exactly what the subject(s) will be asked to do. Attach a copy of any questionnaires or test instruments.

Research is rooted in a post-structural approach to narrative interviewing which emphasises the active and dialogical character of the interview (Holstein and Gubrium 1995) to elicite narratives and interpretations from respondents. Therefore, the interviews are open-ended and semi-structured. I will ask respondants to describe their involvement in rural 'development' and then formulate cues and probes which will enhance the development of the narrative to questions of rural and gender identity.

B.3.c.ii. What is the rationale for the use of this methodology? Please discuss briefly.

The analysis is rooted in the assumption that there are social actors who actively negotiate rural 'development' and narrate their experiences of leadership in ways that do not necessarily conform to governmental discourses. Asking people to tell the stories of their involvement in rural 'development' provides a potential counter-discourse to government documents. Moreover, a discussion of these people's involvement will help answer the questions of whether or not there is a response to advanced liberalism and whether or not they are engaged in a larger politics.

B.3.d. Will deception be used in this study? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please describe and justify the need for deception.

B.3.e. Explain the debriefing procedures to be used and attach a copy of the written debriefing

B.4. Cite your experience with this kind of research. Use no more than 300 words for each research.

As an undergraduate student, I was required to conduct in-depth, tape-recorded interviews with several respondents for various courses. I have interviewed respondents on activities such as bingo playing, Newfoundland Folk Belief, traditional funeral rituals, social movements, and the traditional homemade bread-baking performed by many older women in my hometown.
As well, I have conducted in-depth interviews with respondents who were recruited to take part in the SSHRC funded New Rural Economy (NRE) Project. This was done as part of my employment with the NRE. I have been a research assistant for that project since May 2004.
During my first semester of the MA program at Windsor I conducted 2 tape-recorded interviews for my qualitative methods class.

B.5. Subjects Involved in the Study

Describe in detail the sample to be recruited including:

B.5.a. the number of subjects

10

B.5.b. gender

Female and male

B.5.c. age range

20 plus

B.5.d. any special characteristics

Actively involved in rural 'development' initiatives through their paid and/or unpaid work.

B.5.e. institutional affiliation or where located

Located in rural Newfoundland

B.6. Recruitment Process

B.6.a. Describe how and from what sources the subjects will be recruited.

Through my work with the New Rural Economy Project I have built a rapport with residents in two Newfoundland rural communities. This summer as I continue my work for the NRE I will be in these communities and will talk to people I already know and using a snow-ball technique, ideally will elicit interviews with others involved in rural 'development'.

B.6.b. Indicate where the study will take place. If applicable, attach letter(s) of permission from organizations where research is to take place.

These issues will be investigated in two Newfoundland communities: .

B.6.c. Describe any possible relationship between investigator(s) and subjects(s) (e.g. instructor - student; manager - employee).

B.6.d. Copies of any poster(s), advertisement(s) or letter(s) to be used for recruitment are attached. ☐ Yes ☒ No

B.7. Compensation of Subjects

B.7.a. Will subjects receive compensation for participation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please provide details.

B.7.b. If subjects (s) choose to withdraw, how will you deal with compensation?

B.8. Feedback to Subjects

Whenever possible, upon completion of the study, subjects should be informed of the results. Describe below the arrangements for provision of this feedback. (Please note that the REB has web space available for publishing the results at www.uwindsor.ca/reb. You can enter your study results under Study Results on the website. Please provide the date when your results will be available)

On the consent and information forms provided to my respondents, I will indicate that my findings will be posted on the Sociology and Anthropology News and Noticeboard located on their website at http://uwindsor.ca/socanth.

Ideally I will provide this report upon completion of my thesis, April 2007.

C. POTENTIAL BENEFITS FROM THE STUDY

C.1. Discuss any potential direct benefits to subjects from their involvement in the project.

If this study is a success, we may be able to develop a better approach to rural 'development'; an approach that will bridge the gap between policy and how it is carried out on the ground. Rural Newfoundland is still struggling to prevent out-migration and to recover from the devastating consequences incurred from the collapse of the cod stocks. This research could possibly provide information that will help rural Newfoundlanders and government work together to make the most of what is left and to grow from there.

C.2. Comment on the (potential) benefits to (the scientific community)/society that would justify involvement of subjects in this study.

While there is some literature available on the disparities of advanced liberalism as a theoretical framework and how it is actually implemented, this literature is based in the United Kingdom and Australia. This research would not only ground these theories and practices in a Canadian context, but they may also aid rural Newfoundland in overcoming the problems that it has been dealing with since the early 1990s. Futhermore, this investigation will provide a gendered analysis of rural 'development'. This will build on previous research which has indicated that gender differences exist in Newfoundland and will either support that hypothesis or provide evidence that gender inequality is starting to disappear in some arenas of rural life.

D. POTENTIAL RISKS OF THE STUDY

D.1. Are there any psychological risks/harm?
(Might a subject feel demeaned, embarrassed, worried or upset?) ☐ Yes ☒ No

D.2. Are there any physical risks/harm? ☐ Yes ☒ No

D.3. Are there any social risks/harm? (Possible loss of status, privacy, and/or reputation?) ☒ Yes ☐ No

D.4. Describe the known and anticipated risks of the proposed research, specifying the particular risk(s)/harm associated with each procedure or task. Consider physical, psychological, emotional, and social risks/harm.

The topic I plan to research is not really a concealed or secretive topic in rural communtities and is in fact being openly addressed. So while this research is not particularly risky, I am aware of the small-town gossip which may bear upon the perception of those involved in my study.

D.5. Describe how the potential risks to the subjects will be minimized.

The potential risks will be minimized by ensuring respondents' confidentiality.

E. INFORMATION AND CONSENT PROCESS

If different groups of subjects are going to be asked to do different things during the course of the research, more than one consent may be necessary (i.e. if the research can be seen as having Phase I and Phase II).

E.1. Is a copy of a **separate Consent Form** attached to this application? ☒ Yes ☐ No

E.2. Is a copy of a **separate Letter of Information** attached to this application? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If written consent WILL NOT/CANNOT be obtained or is considered inadvisable, justify this and outline the process to be used to otherwise fully inform participants.

E.3. Are subjects competent to consent? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If not, describe the process to be used to obtain permission of parent or guardian.

E.4.	Is a **Parental/Guardian Information and Consent Form** attached?	☐ Yes	☒ No
E.5.	Is an **Assent Form** attached?	☐ Yes	☒ No

E.6. Withdrawal from Study

E.6.a.	Do subjects have the right to withdraw at any time during and after the research project?	☒ Yes	☐ No
E.6.b.	Are subjects to be informed of this right?	☒ Yes	☐ No

E.6.c. Describe the process to be used to inform subjects of their withdrawal right.

The respondents will be required to sign consent forms that outline their consent as free and informed participants. On this form, I will explain that their participation is completely voluntary, and they are free to withdraw at anytime, without consequence.

F. CONFIDENTIALITY

Definitions: **Anonymity** - when the subject cannot be identified, even by the researcher.
Confidentiality - must be provided when the subject can be identified, even if only by the researcher.

F.1. Describe the procedures to be used to ensure anonymity of subjects and confidentiality of data. Explain how written records, video/audio tapes and questionnaires will be secured, and provide details of their final disposal.

These interviews will be recorded using either a traditional tape-recorder or possibly a digital recorder. If a traditional tape is used then the confidentiality will be ensured by keeping the tapes and all forms with identifying marks locked in my file-cabinet at my home in Newfoundland. Should a digital recorder be used, I will password protect all files once they are downloaded onto my computer; all forms will be locked in my file-cabinet. Final disposal of the interview files will involve deleting them from my hard-drive. If tapes are used, they will be erased. Forms will be shredded.

F.2.	Is a **Consent for Audio/Video Taping Form** attached?	☒ Yes	☐ No
F.3.	Specify if an assurance of anonymity or confidentiality is being given during:		
F.3.a.	Conduct of research	☒ Yes	☐ No
F.3.b.	Release of findings	☒ Yes	☐ No
F.3.c.	Details of final disposal	☒ Yes	☐ No

G. REB REVIEW OF ONGOING RESEARCH

G.1.	Are there any specific characteristics of this research which requires additional review by the REB when the research is ongoing?	☐ Yes	☒ No

If **YES**, please explain.

G.2.	Will the results of this research be used in a way to create financial gain for the researcher?	☐ Yes	☒ No

If **YES**, please explain.

G.3.	Is there an actual or potential conflict of interest?	☐ Yes	☒ No

If **YES**, please explain for researchers who are involved.

G.4. Please propose a continuing review process (beyond the annual **Progress Report**) you deem to be appropriate for this research project/program.

Please note that a **Progress Report** must be submitted to the Research Ethics Coordinator if your research extends beyond one year from the clearance date. A **Final Report** must be submitted when the project is completed. Forms are available at www.uwindsor.ca/reb.

H. SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

Generally, but not always, the possibility should be kept open for re-using the data obtained from research subjects. Will, or might, the data obtained from the subjects of this research project be used in subsequent research studies? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If **YES**, please indicate on the Consent Form that the data may be used in other research studies.

I. CONSENT FORM

If a Consent Form is required for your research, please use the following sample **Consent Form** template. If you wish to deviate from this format, please provide the rationale. Print out the **Consent Form** with the University of Windsor logo. The information in the Consent Form **must** be written/presented in language that is clear and understandable for the intended target audience.

J. LETTER OF INFORMATION

If a Letter of Information is required for your research, please use the following sample **Letter of Information** template. If you wish to deviate from this format, please provide the rationale. Print out the **Letter of Information** with the University of Windsor logo. The Letter of Information **must** be written/presented in language that is clear and understandable for the intended target audience.

APPENDIX C:
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF
WINDSOR

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: **Rebuilding Rural Newfoundland: Advanced Liberalism and the Gendered Interpretations of Rural Development**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by ***Jennifer Butler***, from the ***Department of Sociology and Anthropology*** at the University of Windsor. ***This research will contribute to writing a thesis for the fulfilment of a Master's Degree.***

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact ***Jennifer Butler at*** ***or Faculty Supervisor Dr. Glynis George at 519-253-3000 ext. 2196.***

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study is designed to investigate the role of activists in rural development.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:
Participate in the interview I am conducting and tape recording. It should take 1 ½ -2 hours. A follow-up interview may be requested. All interviews will be transcribed and the transcription will be made available to you for your editorial comment and reflection. The interview will be conducted at your convenience and your preferred location.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

This study may put you at risk for social stigma because of your participation in a study. Coming from a small town, I am aware of how people gossip. In order to minimize this risk, your identity and participation will be kept confidential.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

If this study is a success, we may be able to develop a better approach to rural development; an approach that will bridge the gap between policy and how it is carried out on the ground. Rural Newfoundland is still struggling to prevent out-migration and to recover from the devastating consequences incurred from the collapse of the cod stocks. This research could possibly provide information that will help rural Newfoundlanders and government work together to make the most of what is left and to grow from there.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

Participating in this research is completely voluntary and participants will not be compensated in any way.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.
All forms and audio recordings will be kept confidential. I will ensure that you cannot be identified by locking forms and recordings in a safe file-cabinet in my home.

The only people who will have access to the recordings will be my faculty supervisor, Dr. Glynis George and myself. The recordings will be transcribed and saved until after the completion of my Master's Degree. The tapes will be erased shortly thereafter. However, I will keep the transcriptions in case of future research.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. I may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. ***Should you choose to remove yourself from this study, all materials will remain in my possession.***

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Upon completion of my Master's Thesis (April 2007), my findings will be posted on the Department of Sociology and Anthropology's News and Notice Board located on their website so that you may view them at your leisure. http://uwindsor.ca/socanth

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data may be used in subsequent studies.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916; e-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study **"Rebuilding Rural Newfoundland: Advanced Liberalism and the Gendered Interpretations of Rural Development"** as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form. **I understand that this research is being carried out by a student researcher for use in a Master's Thesis in order to fulfil the requirements for a Master's Degree.**

_____
Name of Subject

_____ _____
Signature of Subject Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator Date

APPENDIX D:
LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: **Rebuilding Rural Newfoundland: Advanced Liberalism and the Gendered Interpretations of Rural Development**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by ***Jennifer Butler***, from the ***Department of Sociology and Anthropology*** at the University of Windsor. ***This research will contribute to writing a thesis for the fulfilment of a Master's Degree.***

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact ***Jennifer Butler at*** ***or Faculty Supervisor Dr. Glynis George at 519-253-3000 ext. 2196.***

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study is designed to investigate the role of activists in rural development.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:
Sign and date all required forms.
Engage in a confidential, tape-recorded interview with Jennifer Butler.
Answer questions related to your experience in rural development.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

This study may put you at risk for social stigma because of your participation in a study. Coming from a small town, I am aware of how people gossip. In order to minimize this risk, your identity and participation will be kept confidential.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

If this study is a success, we may be able to develop a better approach to rural development; an approach that will bridge the gap between policy and how it is carried out on the ground. Rural Newfoundland is still struggling to prevent out-migration and to recover from the devastating consequences incurred from the collapse of the cod stocks. This research could possibly provide information that will help rural Newfoundlanders and government work together to make the most of what is left and to grow from there.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

Participating in this research is completely voluntary and participants will not be compensated in any way.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.
All forms and audio recordings will be kept confidential. I will ensure that you cannot be identified by locking forms and recordings in a safe file-cabinet in my home.

The only people who will have access to the recordings will be my faculty supervisor, Dr. Glynis George and myself. The recordings will be transcribed and saved until after the completion of my Master's Degree. The tapes will be erased shortly thereafter. However, I will keep the transcriptions in case of future research.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. I may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. ***Should you choose to remove yourself from this study, all materials will remain in my possession.***

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Upon completion of my Master's Thesis (April 2007), my findings will be posted on the Department of Sociology and Anthropology's News and Notice Board located on their website so that you may view them at your leisure. http://uwindsor.ca/socanth

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data may be used in subsequent studies.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916; e-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca.

Please note: **This research is being carried out by a student researcher for use in a Master's Thesis in order to fulfil the requirements for a Master's Degree.**

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

_____ _____

Signature of Investigator Date

APPENDIX E:
CONSENT FOR AUDIO/VIDEO TAPING

UNIVERSITY OF
WINDSOR

CONSENT FOR AUDIO/VIDEO TAPING

Research Subject's Name:

Title of the Project: Rebuilding Newfoundland: Advanced Liberalism and Gendered Interpretations of Rural Development

ID# Number:

Birth date:

I consent to the audio-taping of interviews.

I understand this is a voluntary procedure and that I am free to withdraw at any time by requesting that the taping be stopped. I also understand that my name will not be revealed to anyone and that taping will be kept confidential. Tapes are filed by number only and store in a locked cabinet.

I understand that confidentiality will be respected and the listening of materials will be for professional use only.

_____ _____

(Signature of Parent or Guardian) (Date)

Or

_____ _____

(Research Subject) (Date)

APPENDIX F:
ETHICS LETTER OF APPROVAL

UNIVERSITY OF
WINDSOR
OFFICE OF RESEARCH SERVICES
RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Today's Date:	June 29, 2006
Principal Investigator:	Ms. Jennifer Butler
Department/School:	Sociology & Anthropology
REB Number:	06-167
Research Project Title:	Rebuilding rural Newfoundland: advanced liberalism and the gendered interpretations of rural development
Clearance Date:	June 29, 2006
Project End Date:	April 30, 2007
Progress Report Due:	
Final Report Due:	April 30, 2007

This is to inform you that the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board (REB), which is organized and operated according to the *Tri-Council Policy Statement* and the University of Windsor *Guidelines for Research Involving Human Subjects*, has granted approval to your research project on the date noted above. This approval is valid only until the Project End Date.

A Progress Report or Final Report is due by the date noted above. The REB may ask for monitoring information at some time during the project's approval period.

During the course of the research, no deviations from, or changes to, the protocol or consent form may be initiated without prior written approval from the REB. Minor change(s) in ongoing studies will be considered when submitted on the Request to Revise form.

Investigators must also report promptly to the REB:
a) changes increasing the risk to the participant(s) and/or affecting significantly the conduct of the study;
b) all adverse and unexpected experiences or events that are both serious and unexpected;
c) new information that may adversely affect the safety of the subjects or the conduct of the study.

Forms for submissions, notifications, or changes are available on the REB website: www.uwindsor.ca/reb. If your data is going to be used for another project, it is necessary to submit another application to the REB.

We wish you every success in your research.

Maureen Muldoon, Ph.D.
Chair, Research Ethics Board

cc: Dr. Glynis George, Sociology & Anthropology
Linda Bunn, Research Ethics Coordinator

This is an official document. Please retain the original in your files.

VITA AUCTORIS

Jennifer Leann Butler was born in 1983 in Corner Brook, Newfoundland. She graduated from Pasadena Academy in 2001. Following high school she enrolled at Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, Memorial University of Newfoundland's Corner Brook campus. In 2005 she obtained a B.A. in Social/Cultural Studies. She is currently a candidate for the Master's degree in Sociology at the University of Windsor and hopes to graduate in the summer of 2008.